DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 679 CE 038 281

AUTHOR Leach, James A.; Barnard, Wynette S.
TITLE A Study of Cooperation/Collaboration among Employment Training Systems in Illinois. Final Report of the Project Designing and Implementing a Plan for the Collaboration, Cooperation, and Coordination of the Providers of Employment Training.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Vocational and Technical Education.
SPONS AGENCY Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield. Dept. of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE Jul 83
NOTE 122p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; Apprenticeships; Cooperative Planning; *Cooperative Programs; *Coordination; *Educational Cooperation; Employment Programs; Federal Programs; *Job Training; Military Training; Postsecondary Education; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

To collect information related to seven research questions regarding cooperation/collaboration among employment training delivery systems, a three-step approach was used. This included a literature review, interviews with local representatives of employment training systems, and a questionnaire mailed to representatives of the seven major employment training systems. These systems were the military, Job Training Partnership Act, business and industry, apprenticeships, universities, public vocational education, and proprietary schools. The major findings were that (1) employed adults have the greatest numbers of options for training; youth have the least; (2) the delivery systems would maintain and develop the services they currently provide; (3) CETA and community colleges have established the greatest number of cooperative efforts; (4) CETA, proprietary schools, public vocational education, and universities indicated the strongest possibility and desirability to cooperate with other delivery systems; (5) barriers were inadequate communication, turf protection, role incongruence/confusion, confusing rules, and planning-cycle problems; (6) incentives include better resource utilization, service evaluation, and development of a master plan for cooperation; and (7) most conducted internal and external evaluations. Recommendations were made for reducing competition among employment training providers; ensuring training quality, relevance, accessibility, and availability; increasing training efficiency; and ensuring ongoing planning and evaluation. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED241679

A Study of Cooperation/ Collaboration Among Employment Training Systems in Illinois

Final Report of the Project Designing and Implementing A Plan for the Collaboration, Cooperation, and Coordination of the Providers of Employment Training

Project Staff:
James A. Leach
Wynette S. Barnard

Office of Vocational Education Research
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
College of Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Sponsored by:
Illinois State Board of Education

Edward Copeland
Chairman

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education

Research and Development Section

July, 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D Gill

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FINAL REPORT ABSTRACT	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the study	1
Purpose of the Study	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Employment Training Agencies/Organizations	5
The Concept of Coordination	14
Need for Cooperation/Collaboration	17
Problems and Issues of Coordination	20
Conditions and Facilitators of Successful Interagency Coordination	26
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	31
Research Procedures	31
Instrumentation	32
Pilot Testing	33
Sample Selection	34
Data Collection	36
Data Analysis	36
IV. RESULTS	38
Sample and Return	38
Research Question 1	39
Research Question 2	42
Research Question 3	50
Research Question 4	52
Research Question 5	59

Page

Research Question 6 61

Research Question 7 63

V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS 70

Purpose 70

Procedures 71

Summary and Discussion of Findings 72

Conclusions 79

Recommendations 79

APPENDICES 83

Appendix A - Questionnaire 83

Appendix B - Sample Letter 85

Appendix C - References 87

FINAL REPORT ABSTRACT

TITLE OF PROJECT: Designing and Implementing a Plan for the Collaboration, Cooperation, and Coordination of the Providers of Employment Training

FUNDING AGREEMENT NUMBER: R-31-13-D-0411-477

PROJECT DIRECTOR: James A. Leach, Assistant Professor

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Wynette S. Barnard, Visiting Assistant Professor

FUNDED AGENCY: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

LOCATION: 345 Education Building, 1310 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, Il. 61820

FUNDED PERIOD: 8/1/82 - 6/30/83

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PROJECT:

1. Conducted a review of existing research and literature related to cooperation/collaboration.
2. Conducted interviews with local (Champaign County) representatives of the employment training systems.
3. Developed a questionnaire to gain information related to employment training services provided by each delivery system, current cooperation/collaboration efforts, and methods used to evaluate training systems.
4. Collected and analyzed questionnaire data from representatives of the seven major employment training systems in Illinois.

5. Obtained input from consultants - Dr. Paul Sultan, Dr. Robert Chiti, and Dr. Chester Wichowski, on project findings and reports.
6. Developed and printed a report detailing the results of the study and recommendations which may provide the framework for the development of a master plan.

CONTRIBUTION TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION:

This project will aid in determining potential areas and methods for cooperation/collaboration among the providers of employment training. Cooperative efforts can lead to more efficient and effective delivery of employment training.

PRODUCTS DELIVERED:

25 copies of the final report will be delivered to the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education by July 31, 1983.

A Study of Cooperation/Collaboration Among Employment Training Systems In Illinois: Executive Summary

Introduction

Preparing a trained work force for our nation has been the charge of numerous employment training delivery systems. This charge has become increasingly difficult to fulfill in recent years. Changes in the nature and types of jobs performed and overall changes in the nation's economic climate have placed serious strains on employment training delivery systems' ability to prepare qualified workers. Bridging the gap between the skills of today's work force and future demands of business and industry represents a formidable challenge to deliverers of employment training.

The employment training system in the United States has been described as a "non-system"--a mixture of separate delivery mechanisms as varied as the needs that created them. Although this non-system is flexible, it is often inefficient and ineffective. One means of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of employment training is through collaborative efforts among delivery systems. The time is past when one system can go it alone. The number of individuals who need training is growing while available resources are shrinking. Collaborative efforts, which make the most of every available resource, are needed.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the current status of existing and potential cooperation and collaboration efforts among the major employment training delivery systems in Illinois and to make recommendations as to how these systems might better cooperate and collaborate. A three-step approach was used to collect information related to seven research questions. This included a literature review, interviews with local (Champaign County) representatives of employment training systems, and a questionnaire mailed to representatives of the seven major employment training systems in Illinois.

For the purpose of this study, employment training was defined as a system which teaches people about work and prepares people for work. The seven major systems which provide employment training in the United States are: (1) military, (2) Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) (formerly CETA), (3) business and industry, (4) apprenticeship, (5) universities, (6) public vocational education (secondary and community college levels), and (7) proprietary or independent schools.

Findings

The major findings of this study are presented according to the research questions.

1. WHICH MAJOR GROUPS OF PEOPLE ARE SERVED BY EACH OF THE EMPLOYMENT TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEMS?

There is considerable overlap among groups served by the various employment training systems. Employed adults have the greatest number of options for training and youth have the least number of options.

2. OF THE TYPES OF EMPLOYMENT TRAINING SERVICES CURRENTLY PROVDED BY EACH OF THE DELIVERY SYSTEMS, WHICH WOULD BE MAINTAINED OR FURTHER DEVELOPED?

Proprietary schools, public vocational education, universities and CETA appear to provide some of all services identified (career counseling, screening and referral, classroom training, on-the-job training, job placement, and support services) with the least overall emphasis on on-the-job training. The military, apprenticeship, and business and industry seem to have a slightly narrower focus, emphasizing classroom and on-the-job training. For the most part, representatives of delivery systems indicated they would maintain the same services they are currently providing regardless of changing economic conditions and further develop the same or all services given more time or resources.

3. WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF COOPERATION/COLLABORATION AMONG THE MAJOR EMPLOYMENT TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEMS?

Although there is evidence of some cooperation by all delivery systems, CETA and community colleges appear to have established the greatest number of cooperative efforts.

4. TO WHAT EXTENT DO EACH OF THE EMPLOYMENT TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEMS PERCEIVE COOPERATION/COLLABORATION TO BE NEEDED, DESIRABLE AND/OR POSSIBLE?

CETA proprietary schools, public vocational education, and universities indicated the strongest possibility and desirability to cooperate with other delivery systems. They also indicated the greatest need to cooperate and appear willing to cooperate with all other systems.

5. WHAT ARE THE BARRIERS TO COOPERATION/COLLABORATION AMONG EMPLOYMENT TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEMS?

Barriers identified, in rank order, were: inadequate communication, turf protection, role incongruence/confusion, confusing rules/regulations, and planning cycle problems.

6. WHAT INCENTIVES FOSTER COOPERATION/COLLABORATION AMONG EMPLOYMENT TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEMS?

Incentives to cooperation identified by all delivery systems include better utilization of resources, evaluation of services, and development of a master plan for cooperation. Other factors viewed

as incentives by most delivery systems include the provision of quality services, elimination of duplicate services, and legislative mandates. Legislative mandates appears to be the least desirable of those identified.

7. HOW DO THE EMPLOYMENT TRAINING SYSTEMS DETERMINE THE APPROPRIATENESS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING?

Most delivery systems evaluate employment training both internally and externally, although the emphasis appears to be on internal evaluation. Criteria used for evaluation are primarily classroom and job performance and job placement. Wages earned is used very little as an evaluation criterion. Employer needs and wants and individual needs and wants were identified as the two factors used to the greatest extent to determine the type and content of training.

Conclusions

Based on the review of literature, interviews, and questionnaire data collected and analyzed, the following conclusions were made:

1. The focus of employment training varies among delivery systems with public vocational education, universities and CETA having a broader focus than the military, apprenticeship, and business and industry.

2. Most delivery systems anticipate that they will continue to provide the same services regardless of economic climate.

3. There is a concern among employment training delivery systems for monitoring trainee performance, both during and after training.

4. There is considerable overlap among groups served by the various employment training systems with employed adults having the greatest number of options for training.

5. The variance among respondents as to how to cooperate, indicates that there is no one set way for all systems to cooperate.

6. Evidence of awareness of problems, agreement on incentives, and expressed willingness to cooperate, indicate that cooperation is possible.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Background of the study

Preparing a trained work force for our nation has been the charge of several employment training delivery systems which has become increasingly more difficult to fulfill in recent years. Changes in the nature and types of jobs performed and overall changes in the nation's economic climate have placed serious strains on the ability of employment delivery systems to prepare qualified workers. Bottoms and Copa (1983) suggest that today's crisis in the workplace calls for changes in education as dramatic as the changes that Sputnik ushered in a quarter century ago.

> U.S. unemployment has now topped 10 percent the highest level in more than 40 years. Because of major structural changes in the economy, many old jobs are gone forever. Thus unemployed workers must be encouraged to prepare themselves for new job opportunities in such fields as communications, electronics, and information industries, which have jobs available but too few people qualified to fill them. The growing use of computers and other technological innovations in the workplace is creating an enormous gap between workers' knowledge and employers' demands (p. 348).

Bridging the gap between worker's skills and employers' demands represents a formidable challenge to deliverers of training.

Much like other states in the industrial North, Illinois' economic climate is wavering. Illinois' unemployment rate has been increasing gradually and is now at the highest point since the depression of the 1930's. Illinois' per capita income was among the slowest growing in the nation at the end of the 1970's. Many of Illinois' traditional industries have been affected negatively by competition from abroad and from other states. Illinois is in transition from a manufacturing based economy to one which is based on service and information. There is decreased need for less skilled

members of the work force. The nature of skilled work is changing due to technological advances. As a result of changes in the economic climate and ensuing changing requirements of the labor force, pressure is being placed on education and training systems to be more effective and efficient.

Illinois is losing its leadership position while other regions are gaining the lead in offering jobs and investments. David Baker, Executive Vice-President of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, in his report to the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, identified the twin issues of greatest concern to the State of Illinois as (1) the retooling of industries to meet worldwide competition posed by new high technology and (2) training or retraining the work force for the workplace of the future. He further stated that the most effective strategy in reversing the negative transition is the enhancement of the state's basic strengths in the eighties, through investment in plants, cities, transportation, energy and people. Therefore, one means of enabling Illinois to regain its leadership role is through the training and retraining of workers in order to produce an efficient and productive labor pool.

The training and retraining of workers in Illinois, as well as the rest of the United States, is conducted by numerous employment training agencies. The employment training system in America has been described as a "non-system"--a mixture of separate delivery mechanisms as varied as the needs that created them. Carnevale (1983) points out that while this non-system is often lauded for its inherent flexibility to respond to local needs and changing economic and social conditions, it is also criticized for its inefficiency and unfairness. One means of improving the efficiency and fairness of the employment training system is through collaborative efforts

among the providers of employment training. Santos (1983) suggests that the day is gone when one system can go it alone. The pool of individuals who need training is growing while resources for training are shrinking. Therefore, collaborative efforts which make the most of every available resource are likely to flourish in the next decade.

Employment training can be defined as a system which teaches people about work and prepares people for work. Evans (1981) has identified seven major systems which provide employment training in the United States: (1) military, (2) Job Training Partnership Act (J.T.P.A.) (formerly CETA), (3) business and industry, (4) apprenticeship, (5) universities, (6) public vocational education (secondary and community college levels), and (7) proprietary or independent schools. There are, of course, other systems or deliverers of employment training. For example, correctional institutions provide training of varying types and amounts. These seven systems, however, comprise the major training effort.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purposes of this study were to determine the current status of existing and potential cooperation and collaboration effort among major employment training delivery systems in Illinois and to make recommendations as to how these employment training delivery systems might better cooperate and collaborate. These recommendations will provide the framework for the development of a master plan for training in the state of Illinois.

Specific procedures for achieving the purposes of this study were to:

1. Review related literature to identify barriers and incentives to cooperation efforts and examples of current cooperation efforts or models.

2. Interview local (Champaign County) representatives of the employment training systems to gain further information and to verify the findings of the literature.

3. Develop a questionnaire to gain information regarding employment training services, current cooperation/collaboration efforts and methods used to evaluate training systems.

4. Collect and analyze data gathered from the questionnaire.

Research questions were formulated in order to provide a focus for the collection and analysis of data and the discussion. The seven research questions are:

1. Which major groups of people are served by each of the employment training delivery sytems?

2. Of the types of employment training services currently provided by each of the delivery systems, which would be maintained or furthr developed?

3. What is the current status of cooperation/collaboration among the major employment training delivery systems?

4. To what extent do each of the employment training delivery systems perceive cooperation/collaboration to be needed, desired, and/or possible?

5. What are the barriers to cooperation/collaboration among employment training delivery systems?

6. What incentives foster cooperation/collaboration among employment training delivery systems?

7. How do the employment training systems determine the appropriateness and effectiveness of training delivered?

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

This chapter contains a review of the literature related to cooperation/ collaboration training efforts, particularly among the seven employment training systems. Information presented in this chapter identifies and describes: (1) the seven major employment training systems, (2) the concept of coordination/cooperation/collaboration, (3) the need for cooperation/collaboration, (4) problems and issues related to cooperation/ collaboration, and (5) conditions and facilitators of successful interagency cooperation.

Employment Training Agencies/Organizations

The seven major training systems operating in the United States as described by Evans (1981) are: 1) military, 2) Job Training Partnership Act (formerly Comprehensive Employment Training Act), 3) business and industry, 4) apprenticeship, 5) universities, 6) public vocational education (secondary and community college levels), and 7) proprietary or independent schools. The purpose of this section is to briefly describe the major employment training role of each of these systems as presented in the literature.

Military. The employment training needs of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines are related to their primary missions. According to Boerrigter (1983), these missions not only vary by service but also by major command and by unit. Therefore, it is the local base commander who conducts the needs assessment, develops the training plans, and manages the training plans.

Local base commanders are charged with the responsibility of providing the best educational and training service as efficiently and economically as possible. They must see to it that training is conducted when and where it is needed and in the way needed to accomplish the specific purpose or purposes (Boerrigter, 1983). While the armed services provide most of their own training, they also contract for training from business, industry, and educational institutions.

Each of the branches of the Armed Services certifies servicemen and servicewomen in particular competencies. The certifications awarded are known as military occupational specialties (MOS) in the Army and Marine Corps, ratings in the Navy, and specialty codes in the Air Force. In the Army alone, there are over 450 MOS with up to five skill levels designated for each MOS. Every enlisted man or woman has an occupational designation which is the result of formal training (Nelson and Ujakowich, 1980). Generally, the military provides training through classroom experiences and on-the-job training with competency measured by written or performance tests.

Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). The Job Training Partnership Act will replace the former Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) after a transition year. Like CETA, the JTPA training program will focus on the economically disadvantaged, although the definition for economically disadvantaged has shifted. According to Manpower and Vocational Education Weekly (1982), individuals may enroll in training programs if they or their families are receiving federal, state or local welfare or have an income at the poverty level or at 70 percent or less of the federally set lower living standard. Also eligible are foster children, low-income handicapped individuals and those receiving food stamps.

Many types of training programs are available for youth and adults under JTPA. Some of these programs include: job search assistance, job counseling, remedial education and basic skills training, classroom training, literacy and bilingual training, vocational exploration; on-site industrial training, and on-the-job training (House of Representatives, 1982). In addition, this Act allows for "exemplary youth programs" such as Education for Employment, Pre-Employment Skill Training, Entry-level Employment Experience and School to Work Transition Experience.

This legislation for JTPA envisions a cooperative effort between local business and government in designing and running job training programs (Griffin, 1983). The Private Industry Council (PIC), composed of representatives from business (at least 51 percent), education and other community agencies and groups, will be responible for the development of a job training plan suitable for the service delivery area. This plan will determine who receives funds and who will provide employment training to the clients. The selection of the agencies to conduct the actual training is to be based on the effectiveness of the organization including cost-effectiveness and quality of training. Local schools and colleges are to be given the option to provide educational services unless it can be demonstrated that other organizations or agencies would be more effective. Therefore, numerous organizations and agencies may be involved in actual job training depending on local needs and conditions.

Business and Industry. The type of employment training provided by business and industry varies from one organization to another depending on current needs and commitment to the training function. One key to the survival and growth of business organizations is the growth and efficiency of the work force. Training, therefore, is a major effort of most successful business organizations.

According to Kost (1980) industry spends on employee education more than six times the amount appropriated by all the states for all of higher education. This includes the money industry spends as a consumer of continuing education provided by others and for in-house training staffs and facilities. The major objective is to upgrade the personal, technical and professional knowledge, the skills and the competencies of both individuals and the work force as a whole.

Marsh (1976) summarized the training procedures used in business and industry by size of organization. Organizations with fewer than 1,000 employees usually assign the training function to the personnel department or to an administrative assistant. Special courses are offered and published material made available to employees upon request. Medium-sized organizations, with from 1,000 to 10,000 employees, usually have a training unit which develops or purchases course materials, enrolls employees in programs, and usually provides instruction and makes periodic evaluations. The organization of 10,000 or more employees generally maintains sizable internal professional staffs as providers of both technical and professional continuing education or may maintain central or regional training schools.

According to Clark and David (1975) the range of training extends from seminars for Ph.D. scientists at companies such as General Electric to brief orientation for new employees in a supermarket. In between these extremes are training for management, sales, and supervisory skills; training for the operation and repair of equipment; and training for clerical and assembly skills. Historically, most training in industry has been carried out informally on the job. Yet there is currently an increased use of formal, structured training.

Apprenticeship. Apprenticeship in America today is a government credentialing system for developing and recognizing specific skills, competencies and accomplishments (Grabowski, 1983). The U.S. Department of Labor, National Apprenticeship Program (1976) defined apprenticeship, in its simplest terms, as training in industrial occupations that require a wide and diverse range of skills and knowledge as well as maturity and independence of judgement. It involves planned, day-by-day, on-the-job training and experience under proper supervision, combined with technical studies in subjects related to the trade. Most apprenticeship terms range from one to five years depending on the trade involved. The apprenticeship system, then has two key elements: (1) structured training on the job coupled with trade-related theoretical instruction and (2) a goal of acquiring all-around tranferable skills useable in differing employment situations (Mitchell, 1981). Apprenticeship programs can receive public recognition by being registered with state apprenticeship agencies recommended by the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training, U.S. Department of Labor. Programs in states that have no apprenticeship agency can be registered with the Bureau.

There are over 450 apprenticeable occupations, primarily in the skilled trades. An occupation recognized as apprenticeable by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (1976) is one which:

1. is learned through experience and training on the job supported by related technical instruction.
2. involves manual, mechanical or technical skills and knowledge requiring a minimum of 2,000 hours of work experience plus related instruction.
3. is practiced industry-wide as an identifiable and distinct trade.
4. involves the development of skills broad enough to be applicable throughout an industry.

5. does not fall primarily into any one of the following categories: (a) selling, (b) managerial, (c) clerical, or (d) professional (p. 16).

The most current available data indicate a record-breaking high of 395,000 registered apprentices receiving training during a single year. There were over 130,000 new apprentice registrations during this period. Major efforts are being undertaken to expand apprenticeship training into industries and occupations that have not been traditionally strong in apprenticeship. Currently over half of all registered apprentices (56 percent) are in the construction industries. Manufacturing accounts for approximately 20 percent, while services and public administration account for only five percent each (Marshall, 1981).

An apprenticeship is not just a training position but is also a regular job (Glover, 1981). The apprentice is paid increasing wages and is generally retained by the employer beyond the duration of apprenticeship. Thus the apprenticeship system offers a unique type of training in that students are able to earn while they learn. This makes skill training affordable to those who might otherwise not be able to afford it.

Public Vocational Education (secondary and community college levels). Vocational Education is the largest formal work-related training system under public control (Evans, 1981). It is a system of education and training about and for occupations which do not require a baccalaureate degree for entry. By definition in federal legislation, vocational education means "organized educational programs which are directly related to the preparation for a career requiring other than a baccalaureate or advanced degree (U.S. Congress, 1976, p. 2,211)." It enrolls approximately 12 million youth and 5 million adults each year in technical institutes, community colleges and high schools.

Vocational Education programs offer career preparation in more than 150 occupational fields, including industrial, technical, health, agricultural, marketing and business occupations as well as consumer and homemaking skills (National Urban Coalition, 1980). Another integral part of the program is vocational guidance and counseling which helps students select programs which are appropriate to their interests, aptitudes and levels of maturity. Vocational programs often provide additional instruction in the basic skills of reading, writing, and math since most employers require proficiency in these skills.

Approximately 7,500 public institutions offer vocational programs. Students may participate in vocational programs along with a general education curriculum while attending a comprehensive high school. Other students may attend an area vocational-technical school for the vocational part of their curriculum. Postsecondary and adult vocational programs are often taught in technical institutes, community colleges or junior colleges. A typical vocational program includes some classroom instruction, plus supervised skill training and practice in a simulated workplace. Students may also participate in several different types of work-related activities, including work experience, work/study, cooperative vocational education and career education programs.

Funding for vocational programs comes from federal, state and local sources. In 1980 the federal government spent about $800 million for vocational programs, compared to about nine times that amount spent by the states and local communities (National Urban Coalition, 1980). State and local funds are generally used to cover the day-to-day expenses of operating vocational programs while federal funds are used primarily for innovative programs, program planning and activities intended to expand

or improve vocational education such as serving the job training needs of the special populations of handicapped and economically disadvantaged.

Proprietary Schools (Private Vocational Schools). Proprietary schools is one of many terms used to describe an independent or private vocational school. Other commonly used terms are private trade and technical schools and private business and vocational schools. The Illinois State Board of Education defines the private business and vocational school as:

> An educational institution privately owned and operated by an owner, partnership, or corporation offering courses, subjects, or programs for which tuition is charged for such instruction whether by in-residence, correspondence, or other methods to prepare individuals:
>
> 1) to follow a trade;
> 2) to pursue a manual, mechanical, technical, industrial, business, commercial, office, personal service (other than nursing), or other nonprofessional occupation; or
> 3) to follow a profession, if the school is not subject to approval and licensing under any existing statute of the State of Illinois;
> 4) to improve, enhance, or add to the skills and abilities of the individual relative to occupational responsibilities or career opportunities.

Davis (1983) describes private trade and technical schools as independent, small, job-oriented, practical, intensive and student-centered and as operating in hopes of making a profit. Historically, subject matter offered by these schools has been characterized as practical rather than classical. Private schools originally emerged to provide unmet needs and specialized in a particular geographic area. These schools continue to respond to local conditions and training demands by discovering and providing training for specific needs of business and industry.

Although there are many types of proprietary schools, the following common elements generally exist:

- Programs that consist of knowledge and skills graduates need for gainful employment in the workplace;
- Intense instruction provided in a short period of time;
- Heavy emphasis placed upon application;
- Flexibility in program offerings.

Currently there are more than one million students enrolled in privately owned establishments providing job training, representing nearly two thirds of all students in post secondary vocational schools (David, 198[illegible]).

According to M. Gary Tally, president of Brown Mackie College, independent schools are no longer stand-in players but have a distinctive role which cannot be competently assumed by others. Carnevale (1983) stated that proprietary schools are best at providing training for new or highly specialized occupations until a critical mass of necessary trainees justifies the attention of more sizable vocational systems. In order to survive in the marketplace, the proprietary schools must figure out in which field there are jobs, find experienced workers to teach their courses, recruit students in the shortest possible time, and work hard to place graduates in successful careers (Davis, 1983).

Universities. The type of employment training provided by universities varies from one institution to another depending on the specific mission of each university. In general, universities are considered to be the primary source of training of professionals (Evans, 1982). Professions trained for, include those in business and industry, education and public-service. Burkett (1975) also explains that because of declining enrollments in the baccalaureate degree programs, many state colleges and universities have instituted a number of programs such as those found in community colleges, area vocational schools and technical institutes, thus creating some overlap among these institutions.

The Concept of Coordination

Terms such as collaboration, cooperation and coordination are used in the literature to describe interagency agreements. Oftentimes these terms are used interchangeably, although some authors have identified a distinction among them. Definitions which relate to the concept of coordination between employment training agencies are presented in this section.

Greenwood (1982) defined coordination as the following:

> Coordination is the process of identifying the common goals and objectives... having identified the areas of common purpose, the process continues to interrelating the mix and delivery of services toward these common objectives without sacrificing individual program goals or requirements (p. 123).

In this process, each agency/organization maintains its own goals while working with other agencies/organizations toward common goals.

Preston (1980) presented a similar viewpoint when discussing coordination. He stated:

> One aspect of coordination is the identification of common elements in a system or program. It does not aim at the elimination of unique elements. Nor does it imply the definition of one common objective or that only one approach is correct. Finally, coordination does not presuppose the elimination of all duplication since, in many instances duplication is appropriate and necessary (p. 4).

Dr. Kenneth Hoyt (1976) during a conference on career education, explained the meaning of collaboration by distinguishing it from cooperation as follows:

> Collaboration is a term that implies the parties involved share responsibility and authority for basic policy decision-making...Cooperation, on the other hand, is a term that assumes two or more parties, each with separate and autonomous programs, agree to work together in making all such programs more successful. To "cooperate" with another agency or organization carries no implication that one either can or should, affect its policies or operational practices (pp. 1-2).

Hoyt further discussed that the principle of collaboration emphasizes process over structure and the collective good over individual self-interests,

focusing around the question of "How much help can be made available to the individual?' not around the question, 'How much credit can we get for helping?" (p. 2).

The National Institute for Education (1977) touched upon the concept of self-interest in its definition of collaboration:

> Collaboration is a participatory decision-making process involving an organized activity in which representatives from vested interest groups within a community give up portions of their self-interest in creating a new, over-arching identity to achieve a common goal (p. 11).

The collaboration process under discussion in this definition is a community education and work council.

Barton (1977) also discussed the collaborative process from the perspective of a community education work council. He defined the elements of that process without distinguishing collaboration from cooperation:

> A process of collaboration means the participation of the important institutions and sectors of the community that have the responsibility, resources and influence to deal with the whole of the transition to regular adult employment... A collaborative process is identified by
>
> - o being an organized activity with an agreed-upon policy for its conduct.
> - o the participation of representatives of education, business, labor, parents, the voluntary and service oganization sector, the public, students...or at least a sufficient number of the above to provide the expectation of significant achievement.
> - o an involvement in the improvement of the transition arrangements rather than the rest of the group being "advisory" to any one of the represented institutions or sectors.
> - o the development of, or working on the development of, an agenda of substantive actions, a prioritizing of the items on the agenda, and planning, toward actually carrying out the agenda (p. 12).

This definition helps one to visualize what a collaborative process might look like in the form of a community council.

A 1977 report by the National Institute of Education concluded that the collaborative process is based on the sum of its parts. The components of the collaborative process were described in terms that facilitate relationships with industry and education. These components include:

a) an organized activity with an agreed upon policy for its conduct
b) the participation of education business, labors, etc.
c) the expectations of significant achievement
d) an involvement in the improvement of the transition arrangements
e) the development of an agenda of substantive action
f) a prioritization of agenda items and planning toward program implementation

Another term used in the literature on coordination is linkage. Linkage is considered to be the means for achieving interagency coordination. Lauffer (1978) stated that a linkage mechanism can be defined as an exchange relationship that facilitates the coordination of two or more organizations.

Agranoff and Pattakos (1979) identified the range and types of linkage structures in the human services. These include:

- joint planning
- joint programming
- information sharing
- joint evaluation
- purchase of service
- joint use of staff
- consolidated personnel administration
- cross-agency assignment
- colocation
- outstationing
- joint record keeping
- joint outreach
- referral
- joint diagnosis
- case conference
- case coordinator

It is important to emphasize that the development of linkages to achieve coordination is not an event or an end product and it is sometimes

difficult to pinpoint whether coordination is actually taking place at any given point in time. Therefore, planners are likely to increase their chance for success if they view coordination as a process rather than as an end product (Gilbert and Specht, 1977).

Need for Cooperation/Collaboration

As concern over unemployment and lack of skilled workers grows, so does concern about duplication of services and overlapping of training. Governments at local, state, and federal levels, public and private sector agencies, and members of employment training delivery systems are realizing the need for increasing coordinated efforts to provide training. Although motives and incentives for establishing linkages vary among agencies and institutions, Maurice (1982) identifies several common reasons:

> the need to eliminate boundaries and bridge gaps; the desire to improve the delivery of service; pressure to reduce duplication and prevent administrative overlap; the need to enhance the efficient use of resources and the need to establish coalitions so that bargaining power can be increased (p. 275).

The current economic climate has stimulated those involved with education and training, especially in the public sector, to consider greater cooperation/collaboration among deliverers of employment [illegible] and business and industry. According to Appie (1983):

> In times of economic difficulty, when tax revenues are lower and jobs are hard to find, it is not unusual for school programs to become more closely aligned to the needs of business. We can expect to see more emphasis on teaching job-related skills and on disciplining students according to norms that guide the workplace. This shift will be difficult to accomplish, because the U.S. job market is clearly changing. New skills rapidly become obsolete, and new jobs are not being created quickly enough.

A 1980 Position Statement of the National Association of State Directors suggested fostering full employment by providing a trained work force to

difficult to pinpoint whether coordination is actually taking place at any given point in time. Therefore, planners are likely to increase their chance for success if they view coordination as a process rather than as an end product (Gilbert and Specht, 1977).

Need for Cooperation/Collaboration

As concern over unemployment and lack of skilled workers grows, so does concern about duplication of services and overlapping of training. Governments at local, state, and federal levels, public and private sector agencies, and members of employment training delivery systems are realizing the need for increasing coordinated efforts to provide training. Although motives and incentives for establishing linkages vary among agencies and institutions, Maurice (1982) identifies several common reasons:

> the need to eliminate boundaries and bridge gaps; the desire to improve the delivery of service; pressure to reduce duplication and prevent administrative overlap; the need to enhance the efficient use of resources and the need to establish coalitions so that bargaining power can be increased (p. 275).

The current economic climate has stimulated those involved with education and training, especially in the public sector, to consider greater cooperation/collaboration among deliverers of employment training and business and industry. According to Apple (1983):

> In times of economic difficulty, when tax revenues are lower and jobs are hard to find, it is not unusual for school programs to become more closely aligned to the needs of business. We can expect to see more emphasis on teaching job-related skills and on disciplining students according to norms that guide the workplace. This shift will be difficult to accomplish, because the U.S. job market is clearly changing. New skills rapidly become obsolete, and new jobs are not being created quickly enough.

A 1980 Position Statement of the National Association of State Directors suggested fostering full employment by providing a trained work force to

meet current and future labor market trends. Directors believed that a trained work force would attract and promote economic and industrial development.

Representatives of (leaders from) both the public and private sectors are clearly emphasizing a need for greater cooperation/collaboration and establishment of training linkages toward accomplishing a common goal: greater national economic development. Swanson and Murphy (1981) found that the goals of vocational education and training are the same--to meet the labor needs of industry and business. The issue is not so much to debate differences, but to identify how to achieve this common purpose. Communication and understanding are required in order to meet needs through cooperative efforts. This recommendation is emphasized by Leach (1982):

> a coordinated effort between industry and vocational education is essential if training for reindustrialization is to be provided through the vocational education system. Industry must effectively communicate the requirements of the work force in terms of short- and long-range employment needs and opportunities. In turn, vocational education must respond by providing appropriate training. Working with private industry to establsih guidelines about what should be taught in school and what can best be learned at work is one way to begin cooperative efforts to train productive and skilled workers (p. 30).

Burkett (1975) explains that the lack of a systematic approach to the development of our nation's manpower resource has meant that various institutional, governmental, philanthropic, and employer and employee programs often are engaged in performing the same function, and there has been scant attempt to coordinate the efforts. He points out a growing concern about duplication and overlapping of training.

Tuttle (1982) suggested that greater productivity can be achieved through greater cooperation/collaboration efforts between vocational education and the private sector. Further, he stated:

> Through a close relationship with business and industry, vocational education can determine the training needs of the business and industrial community, utilize existing programs already being used by major corporations, and adapt these programs to meet the needs of the small business. By establishing an industrial information/exchange system and implementing an effective marketing strategy, vocational education can then establish a nationwide network of sharing concepts, ideas, training programs, and technolgoy to enhance a whole nation of businesses (p. 1).

Evans (1982) underscores the need for greater cooperation/collaboration by pointing out that nearly a third of high school vocational graduates continue into post secondry, proprietary, or higher education, and linkages among these training systems need marked improvement.

National desire to initiate and maintain effective coordination/collaboration among employment training systems has been especially supported in Illinois. It is believed that Illinois' particularly bad economic plight can be improved through greater cooperation/collaboration. The Governor's Task Force on High Technology (1982) recommended establishment of a network of academic and industrial communications on high technology. The Task Force states that "by enhancing communications this should also encourage collaborative activities, strengthen profitable interaction in complementary endeavors, use available talent to better advantage, and offer a selling point to industries now located out of the State." During 1981 Illinois General Assembly Public Hearings, employers indicated a real need for business and industry to work with the schools in program planning and content development.

Governor James Thompson has launched a major program titled Education for Employment to reshape educational opportunities in Illinois. This program is designed to prepare students for employment in the economy of the future. Up to 25 companies in Illinois will be recruited to work with secondary schools and community colleges. Job training plans will be

developed to prepare workers for current and future jobs. In addition, the Governor is encouraging cooperative education programs which offer on-site training. The plan stresses that only with effective coordination of the private and public sector can students be prepared to graduate into real jobs.

Problems and Issues of Coordination

Numerous studies have focused on the identification of barriers or obstacles to interagency coordination. While the identification of such barriers is not alone sufficient for developing coordination strategies, it can aid in the understanding of existing problems and in developing plans for overcoming them.

Pattakos and Smith (1982) assembled a list of some of the most commonly identified barriers to interagency coordination of human services. Some of these barriers include:

- o inadequate understanding of other agencies' service roles, operating procedues, organizational channels, and proper points of staff contact in regard to client services;
- o insufficient communication among service delivery personnel and supervisors at the client level;
- o lack of interagency case planning; inadequate interagency training in multiagency work with multiproblem clients.
- o "turf," i.e. lack of consensus and trust regarding agency boundaries, commitment to others' goals and objectives, and motives;
- o lack of administrative leadership and orientation toward cooperation at substate supervisory levels;
- o lack of standardized, comparable information about programs, needs, clients served, services offered, etc.;
- o lack of clearly defined interagency procedures, for example in such areas as referral and information exchange;
- o geographic separation of agencies;

- o differences in agency policies and philosophies;
- o confusing and conflicting rules and regulations;
- o interpersonal problems resulting from poor agency cooperation in the past;
- o planning cycle problems, such as incompatible fiscal years;
- o resentment of requirements for cooperation superimposed from above;
- o differing expectations of progress or success for clients;
- o fear of generic management problems, increased workload, and/or adverse economic consequences;
- o perceived threats to agency autonomy, or identity (as in the case of small organizations/programs);
- o lack of adequate models/approaches for interagency linkage/ coordination (p. 18).

While this listing of barriers encompasses the "generic" human services coordination literature, many studies have been conducted to determine the barriers to coordination of employment training services provided by manpower agencies. In a project supported by USDOL which focused on coordination barriers in Federal Region V, Cassell (1976) reported six issues which were consistently identified as the strongest barriers to coordination between agencies. The area of most concern was inadequate communication methods. Issues covered in this area were the need for effective and efficient means of communication and non-threatening means for sharing data and other information. A second barrier identified was confusing and conflicting rules and regulations. Many respondents stated that regulations may hinder coordination and that rules and regulations across agencies are too complex, inconsistent and conflicting, thus leading to client dissatisfaction.

A third barrier identified was turf protection. Competition among agencies, power relationships, lack of commitment to other agencies' goals

or programs, and distrust or suspicion of others' motives were some of the issues in this area. A fear of losing one's identity through coordination was also reported. Information was identified as the fourth barrier and included three categories of information barriers. The first was information about the participants' own and other agencies including agency goals and objectives, methods of operation, names of persons who could affect interagency cooperation. The second was client information needed for coordinated efforts such as client history, demographics and needs. The third was improved labor market information to facilitate long-range planning.

The fifth barrier identified was planning cycle problems. Included in this area were problems of differing fiscal years, the one year time horizon for planning and budgeting which discourages the development of long-range interactive programs, and uncertainty resulting from short term funding.

The sixth barrier was goal incongruence and role confusion. In this area, people found that when planning for linkages based on common services or clients, barriers existed because of sometimes diffuse and converging goals of each agency and subsequent confusion about roles each agency should play in cooperative ventures.

Several research efforts have examined barriers to CETA/Education coordination. The Pennsylvania Department of Education (1980) identified and ranked barriers between the CETA system and educational service sector. From highest to lowest these were: inflexible regulations; unnecessary and burdensome paperwork; different fiscal calendars; divergent philosophies; lack of communication; local conditions; frequent change in personnel; and personality conflicts. Major barriers identified by the U.S.

Conference of Mayors (1981) included a lack of communication and mutual lack of understanding of CETA and vocational programs, different funding cycles, philosophical differences, and turf protection.

The National Association of State Boards of Education (1979) established three state task forces to study problems between CETA and vocational education. The Louisiana CETA/Vocational Education Task Force Committee (1979) identified communication difficulties at the state and local levels, lack of knowledge about whom to contact for assistance on linkages, concerns regarding duplication of programs, and lack of understanding of how CETA funds flow from the federal government to various state agencies as barriers to coordination.

The Maryland CETA/Education Task Force (1979) identified barriers to program development and implementation. These barriers included a lack of communication, faulty perceptions of each other's programs, difference in funding cycles, reservations among educators about the concept of work experience, and difficulties in obtaining necessary assistance from state personnel on various issues.

The Minnesota CETA/Education Task Force (1979) examined administrative problems in CETA/vocational education coordination. Barriers identified included differences in philosophy, attitudes, information and commitment toward coordination; lack of consensus and poor communication between prime sponsors and local educational agencies on issues such as eligible populations to be served, quality versus equity and adequate performance criteria; and differences in geographic boundaries between the two systems. The Minnesota task force attributed these barriers, in part, to the lack of a joint planning process, the lack of an understanding of

each other's systems, funding difficulties, unclear training responsibilities and inconsistent interpretation of regulations and requirements.

A review of three linkge studies in Virginia (Braithwaite, 1980) which also focused on barriers to CETA/educational linkages identified similar obstacles. These included: problems with the twelve-month funding cycle; insufficient start-up time and money; an administrative burden in reporting; a lack of strong state coordination; and a lack of knowledge and information exchange. Two other studies agreed that the following were barriers: the attitude of CETA clients compared to that of the traditional client; program operation and CETA influence; difficulty in the evaluation of appropriate placement; interfacing problems due to the planning process; a lack of clear easy-to-read CETA rules and regulations; cash-flow problems caused by short-term funding; and communication methods.

In reporting the results of a study of the local manpower networks in Illinois, Flynn (1980) identified the following major barriers to coordination: 1) incompatibility of organizational structures and performance criteria; 2) obstructions and system failures in the referral process; 3) lack of information among staff regarding the services of other agencies and appropriate contacts; and 4) unresponsiveness of the agencies in the network to other organizational needs.

Problems and issues related to interagency coordination of manpower and manpower-related programs were identified in a study conducted by the Governor's Manpower Planning Office (1978) in Wisconsin. These included:

- o problems in outreach and recruitment;
- o staff of one agency lack sufficient knowledge of eligibility requirements, the process to obtain service and the resources available in other agencies;

- o limited systematic follow-up results in individuals getting "lost" after referral to another agency's services;
- o assessment in one agency is sometimes not respected and utilized by another agency, resulting in multiple assessments;
- o difficulty in assuring that supportive services (e.g., day care, social services, transportation, income maintenance) will be available in a timely manner--a need therefore exists for staff to understand the eligibility requirements and resources available for different support services;
- o absence of clear responsibility for an individual's supportive services results in the ineffective use of time and resources;
- o multiple contacts with the same employer frustrate both employers and manpower agencies;
- o clients feel "hassled" and confused by the multiplicity of forms required by all the various agencies;
- o manpower service delivery is considered rarely, if ever, as an economic endeavor aligned with other economic development activities (p. 19).

Although not always evident in the "listings" of coordination barriers, another inhibiting factor discussed in the literature is a lack of support for coordination by administrators or the socio-political environment. Many administrators place a low priority on responsibilities to joint activities which are considered to be peripheral to the central interest or function of their organization, thus creating interagency conflict (Molnar and Rogers, 1979). There is considerable evidence that the human element is the critical variable in interagency coordination. The support of the key factors involved is seen as one of the most important factors to facilitate coordination (Roessler and Mark, 1975; Whetten, 1981). Thus it follows that a lack of support of interest by those persons involved in employment training may be viewed as a major barrier to coordination.

Conditions and Facilitators of Successful Interagency Coordination

For every barrier to interagency coordination there is a counterpart which may be described as a facilitator to successful coor nation. The identification of these facilitators can aid in the development of a plan for coordination efforts by providers of employment training. Pattakos and Smith (1982) assembled a list of facilitators to interagency coordination which correspond to the list of barriers presented in the previous section. Some of these facilitators include:

- o development of state agency capacity for comprehensive services planning;
- o top-level administrative commitment to the principles and practices of interagency cooperation, with such commitment clearly visible and credible to staff members throughout the participating agencies;
- o opportunities for professional workers to express their doubts and concerns about the cooperative program;
- o good experiences in the actual implementation of joint programs and successful service delivery to clients;
- o legitimation of the interagency planning and programs by general purpose goverment;
- o frequent communication among participants in joint programs, especially at the supervisory and direct service provider levels;
- o mutual participation in decision-making regarding the joint effort;
- o clear delineation of details of operating procedures, information flow in both directions, and mutual goals for clients;
- o continuous monitoring and evaluation, with appropriate mechanisms for solving problems as they arise;
- o allocation of sufficient staff time and other resources to the development and implementation of the joint program;
- o simultaneous crisis in the functioning of the agencies to be coordinated, i.e., an event not subject to internal control;
- o substantial informal and social interaction between the management staff of the agencies involves;

- o a planning structure significantly committed to the goal of interagency coordination;
- o individual leadership of high status capable of bridging antagonistic intersects, and possessing negotiating skills capable of modifying agency autonomy without destroying it;
- o conduct of expert studies;
- o discriminating use of incentives by management.

Although individual agencies may not have direct control over each of these components, the identification of such facilitators can help them become aware of where their efforts might be focused.

Maurice (1981) identified nine conditions which underlie coordinative relationships. He suggested that the probability of successful coordination is increased if these conditions exist. The first condition identified is that there must be a basis for exchange between agencies since coordination requires that some sort of transaction take place. The second condition relates to the value of items exchanged, e.g., the exchange must be of mutual benefit to both parties. Organizational awareness is the third condition. Awareness refers to the degree to which agencies are familiar with services, goals or characteristics of other agencies and the extent to which each agency is knowledgeable of the potential of other organizations to support its activities. Awareness may also refer to the "degree of personal acquaintance between key staff in different agencies or units" (Easterline, 1976).

The fourth condition identified is mutual respect, confidence and trust which must be nurtured in the beginning of the relationship and sustained through quality interaction and the fulfillment of realistic expectations. Levine and White (1960) identified the fifth condition, access, as one of three important factors underlying coordination. Both physical accessibility and organizational accessability are included in this condition.

The sixth condition identified is communication, or the transmittal of information between agencies. Communication is important for maintaining coordinative relationships because it keeps agencies informed and aware of issues of mutual concern.

Maurice identified the seventh condition as a similarity of attributes-goals and values. Similarity on a few critical attributes is generally considered a necessity for interagency coordination. Having the opportunity to cooperate is the eighth condition. The opportunity is the existing condition, or set of circumstances, that causes one agency to initiate contact with another. In addition to opportunity, agencies must have an incentive or inducement to establish a cooperative relationship. Incentive is identified as the ninth condition and is often related to the anticipated benefits which must be sufficiently rewarding to establish cooperative ties.

Maurice (1981) also identified a list of facilitators to help promote the conditions previously identified. These facilitators include:

- o overlapping membership
- o personal transfers
- o connector committees
- o joint use of facilities
- o centralized purchasing
- o permanent staff liaison
- o joint discussion and study groups for policies
- o joint maintenance of public information programs
- o delineation of constraints and identification of supportive resources for coordination
- o identification, study and publicity of successful interagency experiences in coordination

- o establishing non-threatening settings for interagency personnel to get to know one another
- o making all acts aware of the negative effects of dysfunctional operations and the advantages of coordination
- o encouraging mutual sensitivity
- o assisting participants in broadening their viewpoints
- o interagency study committees
- o training about the role and functions of different persons and units in the system
- o external agency participation in the development of plans
- o imitation of clearinghouse review functions interagency planning team
- o developing and distributing procedures for resolving interagency policy conflicts
- o joint development of data bases, information systems, definitions and publication format
- o use of common advisory structures or committees
- o procedure for giving pertinent agencies an opportunity to have input in policy formation
- o developing specific ways of establishing both formal and informal communication networks such as newsletters, meeting notices, activity schedules (pp 286-88).

In the Virginia Linkage Studies, Braithwaite (1980) attempted to identify the components of successful CETA/Educaton linkages by interviewing prime sponsors. When asked about successful linkage aspects, approximately half of the stockholders mentioned communication as the most important factor. Other factors mentioned were: a) trust, b) good prime sponsors management, c) common interest and interest reinforcement, d) constant contact, and 3) interagency relationships. Interviews with prime sponsors indicated that there were components of successful linkage related to three categories: staff characteristcs, program management and perception of program. Approximately two thirds of the respondents identified

staff characteristics as the reason for success. Characteristics such as enthusiasm of staff, flexibility of staff and agressive staff were mentioned.

Numerous other authors have also identified the interpersonal dimension to be a key component of successful interagency coordination. In a report by the Pennsylvania Department of Education (1980) concerning CETA/Education linkages, it was concluded that linkages between organizations are largely a function of the people involved, and that agency participants were most satisfied with interagency linkages that had been based on personal relationships. Roessler and Mack (1975) concluded their study of interagency coordination as follows:

> In review, it appears that the human element is still, and probably always will be, a crucial variable in improving interagency linkages (p. 20).

Pattakos and Smith (1980) also discussed the importance of the role of leadership to a successful coordination effort. They stated that "irrespective of the focus of leadership responsibility, its significance for interagency coordination strategy development and implementation is unequivocal (p. 29). Davidson (1976) also made this point when he observed:

> Research--based models can assist, but the fashioning of interorganizational relationships of substance is still a job for talented practitioners (p. 135).

Pattakos and Smith (1980) reported that a considerable amount of literature has evolved which characterizes the desirable leadership attributes for planning and implementing effective coordination efforts. They summarized these attributes and included personal characteristics, knowledge and skills and experience desirable for effective leadership in interagency coordination.

CHAPTER THREE

Methods and Procedures

The study was conducted to collect information regarding current and possible cooperation and collaborative efforts among the seven major employment training delivery systems in Illinois. More specifically, information was collected related to seven research questions:

1. Which major groups of people are served by each of the employment training delivery systems?
2. Of the types of employment training services currently provided by each of the delivery systems, which would be maintained or further developed?
3. What is the current status of cooperation/collabortion among the major employment training delivery systems?
4. To what extent do each of the employment training delivery systems perceive cooperation/collaboration to be needed, desired, and/or possible?
5. What are the barriers to cooperation/collaboration among employment training delivery systems?
6. What incentives foster cooperation/collaborations among employment training delivery systems?
7. How do the employment training systems determine the appropriateness and effectiveness of training delivered?

Research Procedures

A three step approach was used to collect information related to the seven reseach questions. First, an extensive literature review was conducted to gather information related to the research questions. The process utilized in the review of literature incorporated a broad array of sources and methods. Sources included the University of Illinois Library, the Employment and Training Administration Resource Center, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, the East Central Curriculum

Management Center, and the Illinois State Board of Education. In addition, a computerized search was conducted of the Education Research Information Center. The methods used in the search for pertinent documents included a computer search, manual library searches, and review of agency resource materials (telephone and personal interviews).

Second, interviews were conducted with local (Champaign County) representatives of the employment training systems to gain further information regarding the research questions and to verify and shed further light on the findings of the literature review. In order to guide the focus of the interviews and to gain some consistency among the interviews, an interview guide was constructed. The interview guide consisted of twelve open-ended questions relating to the research questions.

Finally, a questionnaire was constructed to collect information related to the research questions. The questionnaire was mailed to representatives of the seven major employment training systems throughout Illinois. The questionnaire approach was used as the primary method of obtaining statewide information for several reasons. First, responses could be provided in a short period of time by respondents. Second, information not available from other sources could be provided by representatives of employment training. Third, it was felt that recipients had the desired information and would be willing to respond. Finally, administrative costs were lower than extensive personal and telephone interviews.

Instrumentation

Information obtained from the interviews and the literature review served as the basis for questionnaire development. Nineteen major questions were developed and organized into three sections: employment train-

ing services, current cooperation/collaborative efforts, and methods used to evaluate training systems.

The first section contained six subdivided items to obtain information about employment training services. Section two contained eight items to elicit information about cooperation/collaborative efforts. The third contained five items dealing with evaluation procedures used by the employment training systems. Responses to each item were presented in a Likert type scale.

Selected individuals from the University of Illinois who are experts in evaluation and employment training reviewed the questionnaire for relevancy and accuracy. After an initial revision, a technical review was conducted by a consultant from the Survey Research Lab (SRL), University of Illinois. Final revisions were made based on recommendations of the SRL consultant. These revisions were related primarily to format changes.

Pilot Testing

The questionnaire was pilot tested with representatives of the seven major delivery systems from Champaign County. These representatives were asked to complete the questionnaire and to provide suggestions for its improvement. After completing the questionnaire, the representatives were interviewed to: (1) determine length of time needed to complete the questionnaire, and (2) determine problems encountered with terminology and format and to verify their written answers.

This information was then synthesized and a final revision of the questionnaire was made. (See Appendix A for a copy of the final questionnaire.)

Sample Selection

The population for this study consisted of representatives from the seven major delivery systems of employment training: CETA (now Job Training Partnership Act), proprietary schools, public vocational education (high schools and community colleges), universities, military, and business and industry in the State of Illinois.

Due to the varying number of representatives in each system, the use of one sampling technique throughout was deemed inappropriate. Advice on sampling and data analysis was obtained from Dr. John Ory, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Illinois. It was determined that if the population was 100 or less, the entire population would be surveyed. The following describes the sampling technique used for each delivery system.

CETA (Now entitled Job Training Partnership Act). The representatives of CETA are designated as prime sponsors. There are 20 prime sponsors in the State of Illinois. Since one prime sponsor was used in the pilot study, 19 were surveyed.

Proprietrary Schools. The list of owners of schools approved by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was considered to be the population for proprietary schools. To select the sample, Mr. Roy McDermot, Supervisor of Non-Public Schools (ISBE) was consulted. He identified 21 owners who would be most likely to be willing and able to complete the questionnaire. These 21 schools were then ued as the sample of proprietary school owners to be surveyed.

Public Vocational Education. This system includes high schools, area vocational centers, and community colleges. A sample was selected to insure representation from each of these groups. A list of all public high

schools in the State of Illinois was obtained from the Illinois State Board of Education. From this list, a random sample of 20 percent was selected by choosing every fifth school. This resulted in a sample size of 58. Since the population of area vocational centers number 34, the entire population was surveyed. The population for community colleges is 40. Since one community college was used in the pilot study, 39 community colleges were surveyed. The representative for all of these schools was considered to be the vocational director.

Universities. There are nine universities offering vocational education in the State of Illinois. Therefore, all were included in the study. The representative of each university was considered to be the university coordinator. This officer is a person appointed to serve a liaison role between ISBE, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, and respective university. The university coordinators provide for articulation on a statewide basis through which a delivery system for vocational personnel can be realized.

Military. Eighteen military training sites were identified in the state of Illinois. Therefore, the entire population was selected. The training officer was considered to be the representative for each of the training sites.

Business and Industry. A 1982 American Society of Training and Development membership list was used to identify persons (e.g., training director) in Illinois with training responsibilities in business and industry. From this population, 20 percent were randomly selected by choosing every fifth name. Sample size equaled 83.

Labor Union Apprenticeship Programs. The list of all apprenticeship programs was obtained from Mr. Samuel Young, Jr., Illinois State Director, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. This list included business

and industry and labor union programs. Because business and industry was sampled in a separate category, only labor union apprenticeship programs were selected. From this list, 100 labor union apprenticehship programs were identified and all were selected to be surveyed.

The total sample for the study consisted of 380 representatives of the seven major delivery systems of employment training.

Data Collection

Questionnaire data were collected during the time period from January through March 1983. Three hundred eighty printed questionnaires, which included a cover letter, were sent during the last week of January. Also included with the questionnaire was a self-addressed stamped envelope for it's return. The name and title of all representatives were used on the mailing label. Each questionnaire was coded so that a log of returns could be maintained.

After two weeks, a personalized letter was sent to all non respondents. A second questionnaire and self-addressed envelope were also included with this letter. A total of 202 follow-up questionnaires were sent.

Data Analysis.

The purpose of the data analysis was to provide information related to the seven research questions. In order to accomplish this, descriptive statistics were deemed most appropriate. Questionnaire results were analyzed to determine the means, standard deviations, and frequencies of responses to each item by groups. This analysis supplied data about each employment training delivery system and provided a means for drawing comparisons among the delivery systems. The SPSS statistical package was

utilized to provide standard deviations, means, and frequencies by item and by group as well as the entire sample.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

The purposes of this study were to determine the current status of existing and potential cooperation and collaboration efforts among major employment delivery systems in Illinois and to make recommendations as to how these employment training delivery systems might better cooperate and collaborate. Two primary methods were used to collect information: (1) interviews with local (Champaign County) representatives of the employment training systems and (2) a survey, using a mailed questionnaire, of representatives of the seven major employment training delivery systems throughout Illinois.

This chapter presents the results of the study. The findings from both the interviews and survey are organized and presented in accordance with the research questions listed in the introduction. The results are presented in tabular form and discussed in this section.

Sample and Return

Eight interviews were conducted with local representatives of the major employment training delivery systems, including: CETA, comprehensive high school, area vocational center, community college, university, military, business and industry and apprenticeship.

Three hundred and eighty-one questionnaires were sent to representatives of the major employment training systems throughout the state of Illinois. After two weeks, 179 (46.98%) questionnaires were returned. A follow-up questionnaire and letter was sent to the 202 non-respondents. At the time of the cut-off date, 92 additional questionnaires were received. The total number of questionnaires returned was 271. Eight questionnaires

were received after the cut-off date, which were not included in the analysis.

The total return rate of 72.12% is shown by employment training delivery system in Table 1. For analysis purposes, the delivery system of public vocational education was divided into two categories: secondary level (including comprehensive and area vocational center) and community colleges.

Research Question 1: Which major groups of persons are served by each of the employment training delivery systems?

The questionnaire item which addressed this research question presented five possible groups to be served by the employment training system: a) in-school youth up to 18 years, b) out-of-school youth up to 18 years, c) in-school adults, d) employed adults, and e) unemployed adults. Possible responses ranged from 1 (none at all) to 4 (quite a bit).

The extent to which organizations provide employment training services to the identified groups is summarized in Table 2. Respondents from CETA indicated that they serve all of the identified groups ($\bar{x}$'s > 3.0) except employed adults ($\bar{x}$=1.63). Proprietary schools and community colleges serve primarily an adult population (in-school adults, employed adults and unemployed adults) and out-of-school youth to a lesser extent. Universities also serve an adult population, but serve unemployed adults to a lesser extent ($\bar{x}$=2.75) than employed adults ($\bar{x}$=3.75) and in-school adults ($\bar{x}$=3.38). Apprenticeship programs appear to serve primarily employed and unemployed adults. Employed adults are served to the greatest extent by the military ($\bar{x}$=3.23) and business and industry ($\bar{x}$=3.07). Conversely, high schools serve primarily in-school youth ($\bar{x}$=3.64) and very few adults.

Table 1. Return of Questionnaire

Delivery System	Number sent	Number returned	% Returned
CETA	19	17	89.47%
Public Vocational Ed Secondary Level	92	83	90.22%
Public Vocational Ed Community College	39	32	89.74%
Proprietary Schools	21	15	71.43%
Universities	9	8	88.89%
Military	18	13	72.22%
Business and Industry	83	47	56.63%
Apprenticeship	100	53	53.00%
Total	381	271	71.12%

Table 2. Extent to Which Organizatons Provide Employment Training Services to Major Groups

Delivery System	In School Youth to 18		Out of School Youth to 18		In School Adults		Employed Adults		Unemployed Adults	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	3.63	.50	3.56	.63	3.00	.85	1.63	.62	3.94	.25
Proprietary Schools	1.79	1.19	2.50	1.40	3.69	.86	3.40	.19	3.67	.82
High Schools	3.64	.68	2.01	.87	1.82	.88	1.75	.82	1.98	.87
Community Colleges	2.36	.82	2.73	.88	3.77	.43	3.74	.57	3.68	.59
Universities	1.63	.74	1.29	.49	3.38	.52	3.75	.46	2.75	1.28
Military	1.92	.90	2.00	1.10	2.42	.79	3.23	1.09	1.30	.68
Apprenticeship	1.96	1.12	2.54	1.21	2.09	1.14	2.71	1.11	2.75	1.30
Business/Industry	1.85	.99	1.56	.87	1.95	1.05	3.07	1.12	1.48	.85

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

These data indicate that some of the groups are served by several different employment training delivery systems. For example, employed adults may receive training from proprietary schools, community colleges, universities, military, apprenticeship programs and business and industry. On the other hand, youth are served by fewer delivery systems, primarily high schools and CETA. These findings were consistent with the information gained through the interviews.

Research Question 2: Of the types of training and employment services currently performed by each of the training systems, which would be maintained or further developed regardless of the economic climate?

Five questionnaire items related to this research question. The first item was designed to gather information on the types of training and employment services currently provided by each of the training systems. The services identified were: a) career counseling, b) screening and referral, c) classroom training, d) on-the-job training, e) job placement, and f) support services. The second item further expanded on the type of service provided by asking the extent to which three specific types of classroom training were used: a) occupational specific, b) job specific, and c) employer specific. The third item asked which of the identified services would be maintained regardless of changing economic and political conditions. The fourth item asked which of the services would be further developed given more time and resources. Item 5 then asked which of the services should be provided by other organizations.

The extent to which each delivery system provides career counseling, screening and referral, classroom training, on-the-job training, job placement and support services is summarized in Table 3. Respondents from

Table 3. Extent to Which Organizations Provide Employment Training Services

Delivery System	Career Counseling		Screening Referral		Classroom Training		On-the-Job Training		Job Placement		Support Services	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	3.69	.60	3.94	.25	3.88	.50	3.81	.40	3.69	.48	3.50	.73
Proprietary Schools	3.33	1.05	3.20	1.04	3.73	.80	1.93	.96	3.60	1.06	3.62	.87
High Schools	3.34	.67	2.73	.82	3.75	.41	3.09	1.01	2.86	.76	2.95	.71
Community Colleges	3.69	.53	3.03	.64	3.86	.55	2.94	.84	3.26	.70	3.54	.61
Universities	3.13	.84	3.00	1.07	3.88	.35	3.00	1.07	3.25	.71	3.25	.71
Military	3.57	.51	2.25	1.14	3.71	.61	3.29	1.14	2.33	1.30	2.42	1.08
Apprenticeship	2.51	1.10	3.18	1.00	3.30	.87	3.42	.94	3.30	.96	2.28	1.07
Business/Industry	2.49	.93	2.56	1.12	3.61	.73	3.74	.50	2.23	1.14	2.68	1.14

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

CETA, community colleges and universities indicated that they are currently providing all of the identified services with on-the-job training receiving the lowest rating from universities ($\bar{x}$=3.00) and community colleges ($\bar{x}$=2.94). Proprietary schools also provide all of the services with the exception of on-the-job training ($\bar{x}$=1.93). Although high schools appear to focus on classroom training ($\bar{x}$=3.75) respondents indicated they provide some of all services.

The military appears to provide career counseling ($\bar{x}$=3.57), classroom training ($\bar{x}$=3.71), and on-the-job training ($\bar{x}$=3.29) to the greatest extent. Representatives from apprenticeship programs indicated that some of all services were provided with the exception of career counseling ($\bar{x}$=2.51) and support services ($\bar{x}$=2.28).

Classroom training is provided by each delivery system. To determine the type of classroom training, representatives were asked the extent to which occupational specific, job specific, and employer specific training is used. These findings are summarized in Table 4. The grand means, by type of training, indicate that most training is occupational or job specific (X=3.20 and X=3.21). Representatives from the apprenticeship programs indicated that they provided little of any of these types of classroom training, although job specific was used to the greatest extent ($\bar{x}$=2.00). It appears that most employer specific classroom training is conducted by community colleges ($\bar{x}$=3.39) and business and industry ($\bar{x}$=3.24).

The data presented in Table 5 describe the extent to which the identified employment training services would be maintained by each delivery system regardless of changing economic conditions. Responses were given on a scale of 1 (not at all likely) to 4 (very likely). It appears

Table 4. Extent to Which Organizations Offer Three Types of Training

Delivery System	Occupational Specific		Job Specific		Employer Specific	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	3.81	.75	3.13	.95	2.88	1.03
Proprietary Schools	3.79	.80	3.60	.91	2.87	1.19
High Schools	3.76	.41	3.42	.62	2.91	.77
Community Colleges	3.73	.52	3.82	.39	3.39	.61
Universities	3.25	1.04	3.13	.91	2.50	1.20
Military	2.64	1.45	3.07	1.33	2.86	1.40
Apprenticeship	1.53	1.72	2.00	1.90	1.57	1.72
Business/Industry	3.07	1.02	3.54	.86	3.24	1.00

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

Table 5. Services Continued Regardless of Changing Economic and Political Climate

Delivery System	Career Counseling		Screening Referral		Classroom Training		On-the-Job Training		Job Placement		Support Services	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	3.75	.45	3.94	.25	3.81	.54	3.75	.45	3.50	.63	3.31	.70
Proprietary Schools	3.60	.83	3.53	.83	3.80	.78	2.57	1.34	3.60	1.06	3.54	.88
High Schools	3.44	.67	2.84	.82	3.65	.51	2.94	1.01	2.72	.89	2.87	.86
Community Colleges	3.60	.78	3.15	.70	3.71	.75	3.26	.89	3.37	.73	3.51	.61
Universities	3.13	.84	3.00	1.70	3.88	.35	3.38	1.06	3.50	.76	3.25	.71
Military	3.46	.78	2.58	1.24	3.75	.62	3.15	1.28	2.50	1.38	2.58	1.17
Apprenticeship	2.33	.98	2.88	1.10	3.64	.83	3.92	.94	3.11	1.03	2.77	1.23
Business/Industry	2.85	1.04	2.76	1.09	3.67	.72	3.74	.69	2.46	1.08	2.80	1.22

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

that CETA, community colleges, and universities would likely maintain the same services they are currently providing. Respondents from high schools indicated they are most likely to maintain career counseling ($\bar{x}$=3.44) and classroom training ($\bar{x}$=3.65). Proprietary schools are less likely to maintain on-the-job training than other services. The military would maintain career counseling, classroom training and on-the-job training to the greatest extent ($\bar{x}$s > 3.00), while the military and apprenticeship would focus primarily on classroom and on-the-job training.

Respondents were then asked to rate which services they would further develop given more time or resources on a scale of 1 (not at all likely) to 4 (very likely). These data are summarized in Table 6. Representatives from CETA, high schools, and community colleges indicated they would be likely to develop further all services given more time or resources. Proprietary schools would further develop all service, although less emphasis would be given to on-the-job training ($\bar{x}$=2.86). In the university, career counseling and screening and referral are less likely to be further developed than the other services, although it appears that further development of all services is somewhat likely. The military would place its effort on further development of career counseling and classroom training, while apprenticeship would focus on job placement and on-the-job training. Further development in business and industry would be on classroom training and on-the-job training.

The data in Table 7 represent the extent to which respondents believe other organizations should provide the identified employment training services. Possible responses ranged from 1 (none at all) to 4 (quite a bit). The mean scores for CETA, proprietary schools and universities

Table 6. Services Developed Further Given More Time and Resources

Delivery System	Career Counseling		Screening Referral		Classroom Training		On-the-Job Training		Job Placement		Support Services	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	3.80	.41	3.73	.46	3.81	.54	3.75	.45	3.67	.49	3.19	.83
Proprietary Schools	3.40	.99	3.14	1.03	3.80	.78	2.86	1.41	3.43	1.16	3.62	.96
High Schools	3.23	.78	2.91	.77	3.51	.63	3.07	.83	3.12	.71	3.17	.71
Community Colleges	3.59	.70	3.24	.83	3.82	.46	3.41	.86	3.62	.55	3.62	.60
Universities	2.88	.99	2.88	.99	3.38	1.06	3.25	1.17	3.25	1.04	3.00	.93
Military	3.23	.60	2.08	1.17	3.31	1.11	2.62	1.26	2.50	1.38	2.58	1.08
Apprenticeship	2.80	1.03	2.86	1.05	1.90	1.88	3.08	1.02	3.24	1.03	2.81	1.00
Business/Industry	2.93	1.05	2.69	.95	3.63	.76	3.56	.77	2.39	1.02	2.78	1.12

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

Table 7. Extent to Which Other Employment Training Organizations Should Provide Training

Delivery System	Career Counseling		Screening Referral		Classroom Training		On-the-Job Training		Job Placement		Support Services	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	3.25	.86	3.25	.86	3.44	1.03	3.19	1.05	3.38	.89	3.31	.79
Proprietary Schools	3.71	.47	3.64	.50	3.50	.86	3.14	.77	3.71	.47	3.64	.50
High Schools	3.25	.74	3.25	.73	2.84	.92	3.31	.68	3.39	.74	3.18	.81
Community Colleges	3.22	.61	3.26	.63	2.56	.81	3.00	.76	3.31	.69	3.22	.75
Universities	3.75	.46	3.63	.52	3.38	.53	3.63	.52	3.75	.46	3.50	.76
Military	3.00	1.04	2.58	1.17	2.42	1.00	2.92	1.24	3.08	1.17	2.91	1.22
Apprenticeship	1.70	1.79	1.63	1.77	1.70	1.83	1.45	1.68	1.55	1.78	1.52	1.72
Business/Industry	3.23	.90	3.08	.96	3.10	1.01	2.88	1.22	2.95	.99	2.98	1.07

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

were all above three, indicating respondents from these employment training systems believe other systems should provide all services. Respondents from high schools and community colleges indicated that other organizations should do very little classroom training. Military personnel indicated that other organizations should provide all services except screening and referral and classroom training. None of the services received a mean score above 1.70 by representatives of apprenticeship programs, indicating that they believe very little of these services should be provided by other organizations, although standard deviations of greater than 1 indicate considerable variance on these responses. Business and industry respondents indicated that all services should be provided by other organizations, with on-the-job training to a lesser extent ($\bar{x}$=2.88).

Research Question 3: What is the current status of cooperation/collaboration among the major employment training systems?

The questionnaire item which addressed this research question attempted to investigate the amount of cooperation/collaboration that exists among the employment training systems. Representatives of each delivery system were asked the extent to which they cooperate/collaborate with each of the major employment training systems. Possible responses ranged from 1 (none at all) to 4 (quite a bit).

Data from this questionnaire item are summarized in Table 8. It appears that CETA and community colleges have established the greatest number of cooperative efforts among the employment training systems. Most CETA cooperation occurs with other CETA prime sponsors ($\bar{x}$=4.00), community colleges ($\bar{x}$=3.75), and business and industry ($\bar{x}$=3.60). Little cooperation was reported between CETA and universities or the military.

Table 8. Cooperation/Collaboration Among Employment Training Systems

Delivery System	CETA		Proprietary Schools		High Schools		Community Colleges		Universities		Military		Business/ Industry		Apprenticeship	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	4.00	0	3.06	.77	3.38	.72	3.75	.45	2.53	.74	2.00	.76	3.60	.51	3.01	.85
Proprietary Schools	2.64	1.34	3.29	1.14	3.33	1.05	2.67	1.18	2.13	1.13	1.93	1.10	3.40	.83	1.71	.99
High Schools	2.90	.93	2.13	.98	3.62	.60	3.27	.66	2.50	.87	2.64	1.00	3.29	.64	2.37	.99
Community Colleges	3.66	.64	2.20	1.13	3.40	.60	3.62	.60	3.14	.69	2.29	1.07	3.77	.43	2.71	.96
Universities	2.75	.89	2.00	5.4	3.50	.76	3.25	.71	3.63	.74	2.88	.99	3.00	.76	2.00	.54
Military	1.54	1.05	1.71	1.14	2.14	1.17	2.69	1.18	2.77	1.30	3.00	1.47	2.29	1.07	1.43	1.02
Apprenticeship	1.12	1.42	.90	1.12	1.25	1.45	1.20	1.43	.94	1.16	.79	1.03	1.65	1.79	2.12	1.96
Business/Industry	1.64	.82	1.83	.88	2.00	1.04	2.52	1.02	2.81	.91	1.54	.84	2.83	1.06	1.46	.98

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

Community colleges reported considerable cooperation with CETA ($\bar{x}$=3.66), other community colleges ($\bar{x}$=3.62), and business and industry ($\bar{x}$=3.77).

Representatives of proprietary schools reported the highest cooperation with high schools ($\bar{x}$=3.30), business industry ($\bar{x}$=3.40) and proprietary schools ($\bar{x}$=3.29). Yet high schools reported very little cooperation with proprietary schools ($\bar{x}$=2.13) indicating some discrepancy. High schools appear to cooperate the most with community colleges ($\bar{x}$=3.27) and business and industry ($\bar{x}$=3.29). Most university cooperation is with high schools ($\bar{x}$=3.50) and community colleges ($\bar{x}$=3.25).

The military, apprenticeship, and business and industry appear to have established fewer cooperative efforts than the other systems. All mean scores for these groups are below 3.00 although standard deviations ranged from .74 to 1.96 indicating considerable variance in responses. Business and industry and the military both reported the most cooperation with universities, and apprenticeship indicated most cooperation with business and industry, although the mean score was low ($\bar{x}$=1.65).

Research Question 4: To what extent do each of the employment training delivery systems perceive cooperation/collaboration to be needed, desirable and/or possible?

Five questionnaire items addressed this research question. The first item asked respondents the extent to which they thought it was possible to cooperate/collaborate with other organizations in providing employment training. The second item asked the extent to which it was desirable to cooperate/collaborate with other organizations. The third item asked respondents to rate the extent to which there is a need for their organization to cooperate/collaborate with each of the major employment training systems. The fourth item gathered information on the willingness of

respondents to cooperate/collaborate with each of the other delivery systems. The fifth item further expanded on their willingness by asking the extent to which they were willing to cooperate in providing the following services: career counseling, screening and referral, classroom training, on-the-job training, job placement, and support services.

The extent to which the delivery systems believe it is possible and desirable to cooperate/collaborate with other delivery systems is presented in Table 9. Possible responses ranged from 1 (none at all) to 4 (quite a bit). Representatives from CETA, proprietary schools, high schools, community colleges, and universities indicated that it was both possible and desirable to cooperate/collaborate with other organizations. Military and business and industry respondents saw less possibility or desirability than did the other systems with the exception of apprenticeship, whose representatives saw very little possibility or desirability to cooperate when providing employment training.

The data representing the extent to which each delivery system believes there is a need to cooperate/collaborate with each of the other major delivery systems are presented in Table 10. Possible responses ranged from 1 (not at all) to 4 (quite a bit). Representatives from CETA indicated a need to cooperate with all other systems except the military ($\bar{x}$=2.20). Rated particularly high was the need to cooperate with other CETA agencies and business and industry ($\bar{x}$s=4.00). Proprietary schools indicated the greatest need to cooperate with high schools ($\bar{x}$=3.33), business and industry ($\bar{x}$=3.81), and other proprietary schools ($\bar{x}$=3.28). Respondents from high schools, community colleges, and universities reported a need to cooperate with all systems although in all cases representatives indicated less need to cooperate with proprietary schools than the

Table 9. Extent to Which It Is Possible/Desirable to Cooperate/Collaborate

Delivery System	Possible		Desirable	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	3.69	.48	3.94	.25
Proprietary Schools	3.40	.74	3.40	.83
High Schools	3.38	.61	3.57	.58
Community Colleges	3.63	.49	3.80	.41
Universities	3.88	.35	4.00	0
Military	2.62	1.19	2.54	1.20
Apprenticeship	1.57	1.54	1.64	1.63
Business/Industry	2.67	.89	2.86	.97

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

Table 10. Extent to Which There is a Need to Cooperate/Collaborate

Delivery System	CETA		Proprietary Schools		High Schools		Community Colleges		Universities		Military		Business/ Industry		Apprenticeship	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	4.00	0	3.25	.68	3.50	.42	3.88	.34	2.80	.86	2.20	.68	4.00	0	3.50	.51
Proprietary Schools	2.57	1.53	3.28	1.07	3.33	1.05	2.93	1.21	2.43	1.10	2.86	1.17	3.80	.78	2.17	1.14
High Schools	2.72	.78	2.55	.97	3.59	.58	3.58	.58	3.01	.79	2.99	.82	3.77	.41	3.27	.78
Community Colleges	3.80	.63	2.51	1.10	3.60	.55	3.85	.36	3.29	.71	3.00	.87	4.00	0	3.56	.71
Universities	3.38	1.89	2.75	1.28	3.88	.35	4.00	0	4.00	0	3.75	.46	4.00	0	3.13	1.13
Military	1.69	1.03	2.00	1.04	2.08	1.04	2.54	1.13	2.62	1.20	3.08	1.32	2.62	.87	1.62	1.04
Apprenticeship	1.14	1.35	1.17	1.34	1.47	1.54	1.44	1.54	1.09	1.30	.87	1.10	1.78	1.82	2.12	1.97
Business/Industry	1.79	.90	2.24	.89	2.29	.92	2.98	.86	3.16	.90	1.45	.99	3.02	1.04	1.76	1.11

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

other systems. Military personnel indicated the greatest need to cooperate with other military personnel ($\bar{x}$=3.08) and the least need to cooperate with apprenticeship programs ($\bar{x}$=1.62). Representatives from apprenticeship programs indicated little need to cooperate with other delivery systems. Business and industry representatives indicated the greatest need to cooperate with universities ($\bar{x}$=3.16).

Presented in Table 11 are the data which summarize the extent to which each delivery system is willing to cooperate/collaborate with each of the other delivery systems. The responses ranged from 1 (none at all) to 4 (quite a bit). It appears that there is considerable willingness among CETA, proprietary schools, high schools, community colleges, and universities to cooperate with each other as well as with the military, apprenticeship, and business and industry. Less willingness to cooperate was indicated by the military, apprenticehsip and business and industry. Business and industry representatives reported the greatest willingness to cooperate with community colleges, universities and other businesses. Respondents from apprenticeship programs indicated very little willingness to cooperate.

The extent to which organizations would be willing to cooperate/collaborate in providing six different services is presented in Table 12. The services are: career counseling, screening and referral, classroom training, on-the-job training, job placement and support services.

CETA, proprietary schools, community colleges, and universities appear to be willing to cooperate in providing all of the identified services. The military and business and industry rated the extent of their willingness somewhat lower for career counseling, and classroom training while on-the-job training was rated the highest by each. Apprenticeship indicated very little willingness to cooperate in providing these services.

Table 11. Extent to Which There is Willingness to Cooperate/Collaborate with Other Systems

Delivery System	CETA		Proprietary Schools		High Schools		Community Colleges		Universities		Military		Business/ Industry		Apprenticeship	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	4.00	0	3.56	.73	3.88	.34	3.94	.25	3.40	.63	2.93	.96	4.00	0	3.75	.45
Proprietary Schools	3.27	1.28	3.64	.84	3.73	.80	3.53	.92	3.40	.91	3.20	1.21	3.73	.80	2.93	1.16
High Schools	3.39	.75	3.06	.95	3.76	.33	3.75	.50	3.35	.73	3.06	.74	3.84	.28	3.45	.70
Community Colleges	3.91	.37	3.06	.94	3.80	.41	3.97	.17	3.54	.56	3.51	.66	4.00	0	3.74	.56
Universities	3.88	.35	3.38	1.89	4.00	0	4.00	0	4.00	0	4.00	0	4.00	0	3.75	.46
Military	2.08	1.89	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.62	1.12	2.97	1.13	2.92	1.44	2.46	1.05	1.69	1.03
Apprenticeship	1.27	1.52	1.21	1.46	1.50	1.65	1.42	1.60	1.19	1.44	1.00	1.33	1.72	1.80	1.15	1.98
Business/Industry	2.10	.96	2.28	.99	2.58	1.04	3.02	.96	3.21	.86	1.97	1.03	3.16	1.05	1.78	1.03

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

Table 12. Extent to Which Organizations are Willing to Cooperate in Providing Particular Services

Delivery System	Career Counseling		Screening Referral		Classroom Training		On-the-Job Training		Job Placement		Support Services	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	
CETA	3.93	.26	3.67	.62	3.87	.52	3.80	.41	3.87	.35	3.60	.51
Proprietary Schools	3.33	.90	3.00	1.07	3.60	.91	3.00	1.36	3.14	1.29	3.23	1.30
High Schools	3.72	.44	3.52	.59	3.79	.36	3.53	.75	3.56	.61	3.59	.57
Community Colleges	3.80	.47	3.71	.46	3.86	.43	3.77	.49	3.80	.47	3.80	.47
Universities	3.88	.35	3.50	.76	3.88	.35	3.00	1.20	3.63	.74	3.50	.93
Military	2.46	1.20	1.92	1.04	2.46	1.33	2.15	1.35	2.00	1.16	1.92	1.04
Apprenticeship	1.16	1.43	1.49	1.69	1.88	1.89	1.88	1.88	1.71	1.82	1.41	1.68
Business/Industry	2.67	1.00	2.50	1.03	2.92	.98	2.87	1.07	2.45	1.11	2.47	1.11

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

Research Question 5: What are the barriers to cooperation/collaboration among the employment training delivery systems?

The item which addressed this question presented five possible barriers to cooperation/collaboration among the providers of employment training. Respondents were asked the extent they considered each of the following to be a barrier: a) inadequate communication methods, b) confusing and conflicting rules and regulations, c) turf protection, d) planning cycle problems, and e) goal incongruence and role confusion. Responses ranged from 1 (none at all) to 4 (quite a bit).

Responses to this question are summarized and presented in Table 13. As is evident by the cummulative means, all of these factors are considered to be barriers to some extent. Inadequate communication was rated high by all delivery systems ($\bar{x}$s > 3.00). Representatives from apprenticeship programs were the only repondents who did not view confusing rules and regulations as a barrier ($\bar{x}$=2.61). Turf protection was viewed as a barrier by all delivery systems except the military and apprenticeship. Neither business and industry ($\bar{x}$=2.73) nor apprenticeship ($\bar{x}$=2.33) viewed planning cycle problems as a major barrier. Apprenticeship was the only delivery system which did not identify role incongruence and role confusion as a barrier ($\bar{x}$=2.66). Overall, inadequate communication, confusing rules and regulations and turf protection were viewed to the greatest extent as being barriers.

All of those persons interviewed were able to identify two or three barriers to cooperation which their organization had encountered. Communication problems, turf protection and role incongruence were described as barriers by numerous individuals. Other barriers mentioned, which

Table 13. Barriers to Cooperation/Collaboration

Delivery System	Inadequate Communication		Confusing Rules and Regulations		Turf Protection		Planning Cycle Problems		Role Incongruence and Role Confusion	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	3.25	.68	3.75	.45	3.38	.81	3.19	.55	3.13	.62
Proprietary Schools	3.87	.35	3.50	.86	3.60	.63	2.93	.83	3.08	.86
High Schools	3.38	.64	3.34	.75	3.47	.71	3.01	.69	3.51	.71
Community Colleges	3.20	.68	3.31	.72	3.69	.58	2.97	.79	3.11	.72
Universities	3.88	.35	3.63	.74	3.88	.35	3.38	.74	3.50	.76
Military	3.09	.83	3.70	.48	2.80	.92	3.27	.47	3.30	1.06
Apprenticeship	3.04	1.04	2.61	1.22	2.60	1.19	2.33	1.06	2.66	1.15
Business/Industry	3.24	.83	3.15	1.11	3.32	.93	2.73	1.07	3.38	.84
Total	3.37	.68	3.37	.79	3.34	.77	3.03	.78	3.21	.84

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

were not listed on the questionnaire, were a lack of trust between organizations and reduced funding levels. It would seem logical that reduced funding should actually encourage cooperation, yet two individuals interviewed said that in reality, organizations are fighting for their "piece of the pie" and therefore see it as a barrier.

Research Question 6: What incentives foster cooperation/collaboration among the employment training systems?

The questionnaire item which addressed this question presented six possible incentives. These were: a) legislative mandates, b) provision of quality services, c) elimination of duplicate servcies, d) better utilization of resources, e) evaluation of services, and f) a master plan for cooperation/collaboration. Possible responses ranged from 1 (none at all) to 4 (quite a bit).

Table 14 summarizes the extent to which each system considers the identified factors to be incentives. It appears that legislative mandates are considered to be incentives primarily by CETA, high schools, community colleges, and universities ($\bar{x}$s > 3.00). The provision of quality services was rated high by all organizations except the military ($\bar{x}$=2.75) and apprenticeship ($\bar{x}$=1.43). Likewise the elimination of duplicate services was considered to be an incentive by all delivery systems except apprenticeship ($\bar{x}$=2.45). The three factors: better utilization of resources, evaluation of services and a master plan for cooperation/collaboration, were viewed as major incentives ($\bar{x}$s > 3.00) by all delivery systems. Overall, legislative mandates were viewed least likely to be an incentive (X=2.69) while better utilization of resources was rated as the highest incentive (X=3.58).

Four persons interviewed also identified mandates or legislation as necessary incentives for cooperation. Other incentives discussed during

Table 14. Incentives to Cooperation/Collaboration

Delivery System	Legislative Mandates		Quality Services		Elimination of Duplicate Services		Better Utilization of Resources		Evaluation of Services		Master Plan	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	3.38	.62	3.69	.48	3.50	.63	3.69	.48	3.19	.66	3.38	.72
Proprietary Schools	2.71	1.33	3.73	.59	3.47	.74	3.93	.26	3.33	.82	3.13	.99
High Schools	3.12	.91	3.56	.57	3.39	.63	3.55	.59	3.22	.69	3.50	.68
Community Colleges	3.00	.94	3.71	.52	3.51	.56	3.86	.36	3.29	.62	3.31	.76
Universities	3.63	.52	3.75	.46	3.38	.52	3.75	.46	3.25	.46	3.63	.74
Military	2.58	1.24	2.75	1.36	3.18	.87	3.40	.70	2.91	.94	3.01	1.14
Apprenticeship	1.06	1.33	1.43	1.63	2.45	1.14	3.04	1.10	3.02	.97	3.35	1.04
Business/Industry	2.00	1.15	3.24	.92	3.17	.74	3.42	.67	3.00	.78	3.10	.83
Total	2.69	1.00	3.23	.82	3.26	.73	3.58	.58	3.15	.74	3.30	.86

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

the interviews were benefits to clients, limited resources and having money set aside for cooperation efforts.

Research Question 7: How do the systems determine the appropriateness and effectiveness of training delivered?

Five questionnaire items related to this question. The first item asked respondents the extent to which their employment training efforts are evaluated internally. The second item asked the extent to which the employment training efforts are evaluated externally. The third item asked the extent to which four criteria are used to evaluate employment training efforts. The four criteria listed were: job placement, employer feedback of job performance, assessment of student classroom performance and wages earned. The fourth item asked respondents the extent to which different methods are used to determine the type/content of employment training delivered. Methods identified were labor market data, local employer needs and wants, individual trainee needs and wants, and services provided by other organizations. The fifth item asked the extent to which trainers in their delivery system utilize the following methods to up-date their employment training skills: formal classroom education and training, on-the-job training, attendance at conferences, and newletters and journals. A summary of the data concerning the extent to which each delivery system is evaluated internally and/or externally is presented in Table 15. Respondents indicated extent on a scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit). All of the delivery systems indicated considerable internal evaluation ($\bar{x}$s > 3.00). Most systems also indicated they are evaluated externally, with the exception of business and industry, which reported very little ($\bar{x}$=2.19) external evaluation. Overall there appears to be a slightly greater use of

Table 15. Extent to Which Employment Training Efforts are Evaluated Internally and Externally

Delivery System	Internally		Externally	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	3.69	.48	3.69	.48
Proprietary Schools	3.73	.80	3.60	.91
High Schools	3.13	.62	3.00	.57
Community Colleges	3.60	.60	3.29	.57
Universities	3.25	1.04	2.71	.49
Military	3.67	.65	3.08	1.00
Apprenticeship	3.70	.71	3.15	.96
Business/Industry	3.62	.73	2.19	1.05
Total	3.55	.70	3.09	.75

a. A ratng scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

internal evaluation than external when assessing employment training efforts.

The data presented in Table 16 describe the extent to which the criteria of job placement, job performance, classroom performance and wages earned, are used to evaluate employment training efforts. Responses ranged from 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit). Job placement appears to be the primary criterion (x=4.00) used by CETA, although all criteria are used somewhat ($\bar{x}$s > 3.00). Proprietary schools ($\bar{x}$=2.93), high schools ($\bar{x}$=2.31), and community colleges ($\bar{x}$=2.83), indicated that while all criteria are utilized, wages earned is used to a lesser extent.

Universities and the military clearly used classroom performance to the greatest extent ($\bar{x}$=3.75, $\bar{x}$=3.18) and wages earned to the least extent ($\bar{x}$=2.75, $\bar{x}$=1.64). Job performance is the criterion most used by apprenticeship ($\bar{x}$=3.55) and business and industry ($\bar{x}$=3.23). Wages earned is seldom used by business and industry ($\bar{x}$=1.63).

For all delivery systems combined, the criterion used to the greatest extent to evaluate employment training efforts is classroom performance (X=3.44), followed by job placement (X=3.41), job performance (X=3.26) and wages earned (X=2.56).

Respondents indicated the extent to which labor market data, local employer needs and wants, individual trainee needs and wants and services provided by other organizations are methods used to determine the type/content of employment training by responding on a scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit). These data are summarized in Table 17. It appears that labor market data are used to some extent by all delivery systems except the military ($\bar{x}$=1.75) and business and industry ($\bar{x}$=2.11) who use it very

Table 16. Criteria Used to Evaluate Employment Training Efforts

Delivery System	Job Placement		Job Performance		Classroom Performance		Wages	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	4.00	0	3.19	.66	3.44	.63	3.44	.51
Proprietary Schools	3.60	1.06	3.47	.83	3.67	.82	2.93	.96
High Schools	3.20	.61	3.29	.70	3.49	.61	2.31	.71
Community Colleges	3.69	.47	3.77	.49	3.77	.43	2.83	.71
Universities	3.13	.84	2.88	.64	3.75	.46	2.75	.71
Military	2.00	1.27	2.73	1.27	3.18	.98	1.64	.92
Apprenticeship	2.79	1.23	3.55	.78	3.13	1.06	2.98	1.19
Business/Industry	2.07	1.03	3.23	1.03	3.07	1.00	1.63	.85
Total	3.41	.81	3.26	.80	3.44	.75	2.56	.82

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

Table 17. Methods Used to Determine Type/Content of Employment Training

Delivery System	Labor Market Data		Employer Needs and Wants		Individual Needs and Wants		Services by Other Organizations	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	3.50	.63	3.69	.48	3.63	.50	3.31	.70
Proprietary Schools	3.43	.94	3.73	.80	3.27	.88	2.31	.86
High Schools	2.95	.65	3.38	.67	3.26	.71	2.76	.61
Community Colleges	3.54	.51	3.89	.32	3.46	.61	3.00	.64
Universities	2.88	.64	3.00	.76	3.63	.74	2.63	.52
Military	1.75	1.06	2.33	1.50	2.91	1.14	2.18	.87
Apprenticeship	3.15	1.10	3.54	.76	2.63	1.08	1.56	.87
Business/Industry	2.11	1.09	3.08	1.23	3.32	.87	3.32	1.03
Total	2.91	.83	3.33	.82	3.26	.82	2.51	.76

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

little. Employer needs and wants are also utilized by each system ($\bar{x}$s > 3.00) with the exception of the military ($\bar{x}$=2.33). The military and apprenticeship use individual needs and wants to a lesser extent than do the other systems. While CETA uses services provided by other organizations as a means for determining the content of employment training ($\bar{x}$=3.31), other systems use this method to a lesser extent.

Methods utilized by all systems, from greatest to least extent were: employer needs and wants (X=3.33), individual needs and wants (X=3.26), labor market data (X=2.91) and services provided by other organizations (X=2.51).

The data on how trainers up-date their employment training skills are summarized in Table 18. On a scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit), respondents indicated the extent to which they utilized formal classroom education and training, on-the-job training, attendance at conferences, and newsletters and journals. Respondents from CETA, high schools, proprietary schools, community colleges, military and business and industry indicated that all of these methods were used to a considerable extent (means ranged from 2.93 to 3.67). Universities also used all methods although on-the-job training was used to a lesser extent ($\bar{x}$=2.75). The extent to which these methods were used by trainers in apprenticeship programs was less (mean range of 2.40 to 2.96) than for other systems. Overall, all methods were used to approximately the same extent, with on-the-job training used slightly less.

Table 18. Methods Used to Update Employment Training Skills

Delivery System	Classroom Training		On-the-Job Training		Conferences		Newsletters and Journals	
	$\bar{x}$[a]	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd	$\bar{x}$	sd
CETA	3.13	.62	3.40	.63	3.63	.62	3.44	.73
Proprietary Cshools	3.47	.92	3.00	1.11	3.40	.83	3.43	.94
High Schools	3.35	.64	3.08	.73	3.13	.67	3.15	.64
Community Colleges	3.49	.61	3.00	.80	3.37	.55	3.31	.76
Universities	3.25	.89	2.75	1.28	3.63	.52	3.63	.52
Military	3.67	.49	3.17	1.12	3.25	.45	2.92	.90
Apprenticeship	2.47	1.37	2.96	1.30	2.40	1.17	2.83	1.14
Business/Industry	3.31	.75	3.57	.74	3.33	.69	3.45	.63
Total	3.27	.79	3.12	.96	3.27	.69	3.27	.78

a. A rating scale of 1 (none) to 4 (quite a bit) was used.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Discussion, and Recommendations

Purpose

The primary purposes of this study were to determine the current status of existing and potential cooperation/collaboration efforts among the major employment training delivery systems in Illinois and to make recommendations as to how these delivery systems might provide more efficient and effective employment training. These recommendations could provide a framework for the development of a master plan for training in the state of Illinois. More specifically, information was collected related to seven research questions:

1. Which major groups of people are served by each of the employment training delivery systems?
2. Of the types of employment training services currently provided by each of the delivery systems, which would be maintained or further developed?
3. What is the current status of cooperation/collaboration among the major employment training delivery systems?
4. To what extent do each of the employment training delivery systems perceive cooperation/collaboration to be needed, desired, and/or possible?
5. What are the barriers to cooperation/collaboration among employment training delivery systems?
6. What incentives foster cooperation/collaboration among employment training delivery systems?
7. How do the employment training systems determine the appropriateness and effectiveness of training delivered?

This study collected information from seven major employment training delivery systems: CETA (now J.T.P.A.), proprietary schools, public vocational education (high schools and community colleges), universities, the military, union apprenticeship programs, and business and industry.

Procedures

A three step approach was used to collect information related to the seven research questions. First, an extensive literature review was conducted to gather information related to the research questions. Second, interviews were conducted with local (Champaign County) representatives of the employment training systems to gain further information related to the research questions and to verify and shed further light on the findings of the literature review.

Third, a questionnaire was constructed to collect information related to the research questions. Information obtained from the interviews and the literature review served as the basis for questionnaire development. Nineteen major questions were developed and organized into three sections: employment training services, current cooperation/collaboration efforts, and methods used to evaluate training systems. The questionnaire was mailed to representatives of the seven major employment training systems in Illinois: CETA (currently J.T.P.A.), proprietary schools, public vocational education (secondary level and community colleges), universities, military, union apprenticeship programs and business and industry. For analysis and discussion purposes, the system of public vocational education was divided into two categories, secondary level (including comprehensive high schools and area vocational centers) and community colleges.

Three hundred and eighty-one questionnaires were sent to representatives of the major employment training delivery systems throughout the state of Illinois. After one follow-up 271 questionnaires were received. The total response rate was 71.12%.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

The major findings are presented and discussed according to the research questions. These summaries represent only the major findings, based upon the results presented in Chapter IV.

Research Question 1: Which major groups of people are served by each of the employment training delivery systems?

It appears that there is considerable overlap in groups served by employment training systems. Some groups, such as employed adults, are served by six of the eight delivery systems identified while a group such as out-of-school youth is served by only one system. It is apparent that overall, adults have more options as to where to receive employment training than do youth. This finding would be expected since there are age limits as to when persons can enter systems such as the military and business and industry, thus limiting youth's options.

Research Question 2: Of the types of employment training services currently provided by each of the delivery systems, which would be maintained or further developed?

Most of the services identified are being provided by a majority of the employment training delivery systems. In general, the traditional education systems (proprietary schools, public vocational education, universities) and CETA appear to be trying to provide some of all services, with the least emphasis on on-the-job training. The military, apprenticeship and business and industry seem to have a slightly more narrow focus, emphasizing classroom and on-the-job training. For the most part, representatives of delivery systems indicated they would maintain the same services they are currently providing regardless of changing economic

conditions and further develop the same or all services given more time or resources. With the exception of apprenticeship, representatives of the systems appear to believe that other systems should also provide most services.

Once again these findings are consistent with the literature and what was expected. The educational systems and CETA have a broader mission and are therefore likely to provide comprehensive services. The missions of systems such as the military, business and industry, and apprenticeship are more narrow--primarily to provide job training to persons who have already chosen to enter a specific field. Therefore, it is perhaps less necessary and less profitable to provide guidance services such as counseling and job placement. It is also human nature to want to maintain or further develop the same services, thereby protecting one's own job and portion of economic resources.

Research Question 3: What is the current status of cooperation/collaboration among the major employment training delivery systems?

The findings indicate that CETA and community colleges appear to have established the greatest number of cooperative efforts among the employment training delivery systems. As established by law, CETA is considered to be primarily a broker of training and is required to cooperate with educational systems. In addition, there has been money available to establish these cooperative efforts. Therefore, it is logical that they would lead the field in having established cooperative efforts. Community colleges, by their very nature, must be responsive to local needs in order to survive. It appears that they have established linkages as one means to respond to local needs.

Representatives of high schools, community colleges, and universities indicated that they have established linkages with each other. In the traditional education system, students often move from the high school to community colleges and/or universities, therefore it has been necessary for these systems to work together in order to coordinate their programs. These systems, as well as CETA and proprietary schools, also indicate coordination with business and industry. This is an encouraging sign, in that cooperation between education and work has become a major thrust in today's society. Yet, business and industry indicated much less cooperation with these systems. This finding is somewhat inconsistent with the literature which indicates considerable cooperation by business and industry with education, through participation in local advisory committees, Private Industry Councils and cooperative training with community colleges. This discrepancy may mean that systems view cooperation differently or that cooperative efforts are simply a smaller part of the total training function of business and industry than other systems; and therefore, respondents perceive it as less well established.

Overall, the military, apprenticeship and business and industry indicated they have established fewer linkages than the other systems, with apprenticeship showing the least number. Again, numerous examples may be found in the literature demonstrating cooperation between these systems and others. These systems do cooperate, but perhaps they put less emphasis on cooperation. Previously discussed data indicate that these systems also serve a limited population with fewer services, demonstrating a more narrowly defined mission. Because of this, there has likely been less opportunity or perceived need to establish cooperate efforts.

Research Question 4: To what extent do each of the employment training delivery systems perceive cooperation/collaboration to be needed, desirable and/or possible?

CETA and the traditional educational systems indicated the strongest possibility and desirability to cooperate with other delivery systems. These systems also indicated the greatest need to cooperate and appear willing to cooperate with all other systems. Many factors may be contributing to the positive attitude toward cooperation by representatives of these systems. For example, statutory requirements have mandated cooperation between CETA and other systems. Also, there has been a considerable amount written in educational literature about the need, desirability and benefits of cooperation and collaboration. These systems are also feeling the effect of budget cuts and the current economic climate in terms of providing training and finding jobs for trainees. Although cooperation is not a cure-all, these systems may be willing to try to create linkages as one means of improving the current situation.

In general, the military, apprenticeship and business and industry saw less possibility or desirability to cooperate. Business and industry indicated some need and willingness to cooperate with community colleges and universities, but the military and apprenticeship indicated very little need or willingness to cooperate. Again, this finding is somewhat contradictory to examples cited in the literature and interviews, which indicated considerable willingness to establish linkages. Budget cuts and the current economic condition may have affected these systems to a lesser degree. There has also been less promotion of linkages within these systems. As previously discussed, it is also likely that there is less need to cooperate

because of a more narrowly defined mission and target population. Perhaps, there is less emphasis in these systems on cooperation as part of the total training effort, although a willingness may exist to cooperate in individual efforts.

Research Question 5: What are the barriers to cooperation/collaboration among employment training delivery systems?

The literature review identified inadequate communication, turf protection, role incongruence/confusion, confusing rules/regulations and planning cycle problems as barriers to cooperation/collaboration. The findings of the survey verified the findings of the literature review. Inadequate communication between delivery systems has been cited as the primary barrier to cooperation in numerous studies. If communication can be established or improved, other barriers will likely be resolved. For example, improved communication might reduce role incongruence/confusion. Identifying, clarifying and communicating an organization's role and responsibility for training will likely reduce the effect of role incongruence/confusion as a barrier. Representatives of all delivery systems surveyed identified this as a major barrier, thus verifying what was expected and pointing to the need for improved communications.

Turf protection was identified as a barrier by all systems except the military and apprenticeship. Possibly that these systems perceive their role and territory as well-defined thus reducing the fear of losing identity or responsibilities. Planning cycle problems was identified as a barrier to a lesser extent than the other factors. Generally, planning cycle problems are not continuous, but rather a "one-time" obstacle. Once a planning cycle problem has been resolved between agencies, it is not likely to be an obstacle in the future. Therefore, cooperative efforts already established are contributing to the reduction of this barrier.

Research Question 6: What incentives foster cooperation/collaboration among employment training delivery systems?

Incentives to cooperation identified by all delivery systems include better utilization of resources, evaluation of services and a master plan for cooperation. Other factors viewed as incentives by most delivery systems include the provision of quality services, elimination of duplicate services and legislative mandates. Legislative mandates appears to be the least desirable of those identified. These incentives were identified from the literature and verified by the respondent sample. In a time of budgetary cuts, it is not surprising that better utilization of resources was identified as the major incentive since cooperation can help to reduce the cost of training. The fact that legislative mandates was rated least desirable is consistent with the philosophy that cooperation, by nature, is a voluntary activity and cannot be mandated. Respondent's desire for a master plan also reinforces the idea that representatives desire help in planning for cooperation rather than being forced to do so.

Research Question 7: How do the employment training systems determine the appropriateness and effectiveness of training?

Most delivery systems evaluate their employment training both internally and externally, although the emphasis appears to be on internal evaluation. The desire to evaluate internally is consistent with the finding that the least desirable incentive for cooperation is legislative mandates. Systems prefer to plan and evaluate training internally rather than because of external pressure. The criteria used for evaluation are primarily classroom and job performance and job placement. Wages earned is used very little as a criterion.

The two factors used to the greatest extent to determine the type/content of training were identified as employer needs and wants and individual needs and wants. The use of employer needs and wants, indicates an emphasis on responsiveness to local employer needs. Not using labor market data may indicate that labor market data are not pertinent to the needs of delivery systems or not thought to be valuable or accurate. Taking into consideration both individual trainee and employer needs when planning training would appear to be a sound educational practice and shows a concern for all parties involved in training.

Conclusions

Based on the review of literature, interviews, and questionnaire data collected and analyzed, the following conclusions were made:

1. The focus of employment training varies among delivery systems with public vocational education, universities and CETA having a broader focus than the military, apprenticeship, and business and industry.
2. Most delivery systems anticipate that they will continue to provide the same services regardless of economic climate.
3. There is a concern among employment training delivery systems for monitoring trainee performance, both during and after training.
4. There is considerable overlap among groups served by the various employment training systems with employed adults having the greatest number of options for training.
5. The variance among respondents as to how to cooperate, indicates that there is no one set way for all systems to cooperate.
6. Evidence of awareness of problems, agreement on incentives, and expressed willingness to cooperate, indicate that cooperation is possible.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were based on the literature reviewed, interviews, and survey findings.

I. REDUCE COMPETITION AND ENCOURAGE COOPERATION AMONG THE PROVIDERS OF EMPLOYMENT TRAINING.

A. Improve communication among delivery systems through mechanisms such as joint committees, newsletters, and personal contacts.

B. Initiate regional planning of employment training efforts.

C. Utilize formal cooperation arrangements such as contracts and joint agreements.

D. Provide incentives to cooperate in the form of funding or priority given to proposals developed around cooperative activities.

II. ENSURE THE QUALITY AND RELEVANCE OF EMPLOYMENT TRAINING.

A. Provide training content that is based on the expressed needs of employers and work force projections.

B. Utilize effective and appropriate training methods.

C. Monitor participants' employment training and job performance.

D. Maintain a high quality of trainer performance by effectively recruiting and selecting trainers and by providing an opportunity for them to upgrade their employment training skills.

III. ENSURE THAT EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS ARE ACCESSIBLE AND AVAILABLE.

A. Establish procedures whereby the needs of individuals can be matched with the appropriate delivery system through guidance activities such as testing and career counseling.

B. Provide an opportunity to ensure an individual's readiness to enter particular employment training systems through such services as remedial education and support services.

C. Maximize participation in employment training by offering training which is affordable and flexible in terms of time and geographic accessibility.

IV. INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY OF EMPLOYMENT TRAINING.

A. Reduce duplication of efforts in providing employment training by decreasing competition and encouraging cooperation.

B. Encourage the timeliness of training through a flexible system to initiate, phase-out, and fund training programs.

V. ENSURE ONGOING PLANNING AND EVALUATION OF THE EMPLOYMENT TRAINING SYSTEM AND ITS COMPONENTS.

A. Utilize forecasting and evaluation data to plan for the renewal and updating of the employment training system.

B. Evaluate the effectiveness of the employment training system and its components both internally (self-assessment) and externally.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

Dear Colleague:

The following survey instrument regarding cooperation/collaboration among employment training delivery systems in Illinois is part of a project funded by the Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education. The project is being conducted by the Department of Vocational and Technical Education at the University of Illinois.

Focus of the project is on the development of a comprehensive plan for employment training in Illinois which would enable providers to be more effective in delivering skill training programs and services. Implementation of such a plan would enable providers of employment training to cooperate and collaborate in their administrative, program, and service efforts.

You have been identified as having expertise and experience in employment training. Therefore, your responses to the questionnaire will be highly valued. Input from individuals like yourself will provide project staff with information about cooperation/collaboration efforts in Illinois and will assist us in the development of a comprehensive plan of employment training.

Please complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible. A stamped envelope is included for your convenience. I will be pleased to send you a summary of the survey results if you desire. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

James A. Leach

James A. Leach
Project Director

JL:cja

enclosures

Code_____

EMPLOYMENT TRAINING SURVEY

(Please circle one answer code to the right of each question.)

A. Employment Training Services

1. To what extent does your organization provide the following employment training services?

	None at all	Very Little	Some	Quite a bit
a. career counseling	1	2	3	4
b. screening and referral	1	2	3	4
c. classroom training	1	2	3	4
d. on-the-job training	1	2	3	4
e. job placement	1	2	3	4
f. support services	1	2	3	4
g. other *(please specify)*_____				
_____	1	2	3	4

2. How likely is it that your organization will continue to provide the following services regardless of changing economic and political conditions?

	Not at all Likely	Very Unlikely	Somewhat Likely	Very Likely
a. career counseling	1	2	3	4
b. screening and referral	1	2	3	4
c. classroom training	1	2	3	4
d. on-the-job training	1	2	3	4
e. job placement	1	2	3	4
f. support services	1	2	3	4
g. other *(please specify)*_____				
_____	1	2	3	4

3. How likely is it that these services will be further developed given more time or resources?	Not at all Likely	Very Unlikely	Somewhat Likely	Very Likely
a. career counseling	1	2	3	4
b. screening and referral	1	2	3	4
c. classroom training	1	2	3	4
d. on-the-job training	1	2	3	4
e. job placement	1	2	3	4
f. support services	1	2	3	4
g. other *(please specify)*_____				
_____	1	2	3	4

4. To what extent does your organization provide employment training services for the following groups?	None at all	Very Little	Some	Quite a bit
a. in school youth up to 18 years	1	2	3	4
b. out of school youth up to 18 years	1	2	3	4
c. in school adults	1	2	3	4
d. employed adults	1	2	3	4
e. unemployed adults	1	2	3	4

5. To what extent do you believe other employment training organizations should provide the following services:	None at all	Very Little	Some	Quite a bit
a. career counseling	1	2	3	4
b. screening and referral	1	2	3	4
c. classroom training	1	2	3	4
d. on-the-job training	1	2	3	4
e. job placement	1	2	3	4
f. support services	1	2	3	4
g. other *(please specify)*_____				
_____	1	2	3	4

6. To what extent does your organization provide the following types of classroom training:				
a. occupational specific (skills, concepts and attitudes with common usefulness to a family of occupations)	1	2	3	4
b. job specific (highly specialized skills, concepts and attitudes directly relating to a single job classification)	1	2	3	4
c. employer specific (highly specialized skills, concepts and attitudes directly relating to a specific employer)	1	2	3	4

B. Cooperation/Collaboration Efforts

	None at all	Very Little	Some	Quite a bit
7. To what extent do you think it is *possible* to cooperate/collaborate with other organizations when providing employment training?	1	2	3	4
8. To what extent do you think it is *desirable* to cooperate/collaborate with other organizations when providing employment training?	1	2	3	4
9. To what extent is there a NEED for your organization to cooperate/ collaborate with the following organizations?				
a. CETA (now titled Job Training Partnership Act)	1	2	3	4
b. Proprietary schools (private vocational schools)	1	2	3	4
c. High schools	1	2	3	4
d. Community colleges	1	2	3	4
e. Universities	1	2	3	4
f. U.S. Military	1	2	3	4
g. Business and industry	1	2	3	4
h. Labor union apprenticeship programs	1	2	3	4
i. Other *(please specify)*_____				
_____	1	2	3	4

10. To what extent DOES your organization cooperate/collaborate with the following organizations?	None at all	Very Little	Some	Quite a bit
a. CETA (now titled Job Training Partnership Act)	1	2	3	4
b. Proprietary schools (private vocational schools)	1	2	3	4
c. High schools	1	2	3	4
d. Community colleges	1	2	3	4
e. Universities	1	2	3	4
f. U.S. Military	1	2	3	4
g. Business and industry	1	2	3	4
h. Labor union apprenticeship programs	1	2	3	4
i. Other *(please specify)*_____				
_____	1	2	3	4
11. To what extent would your organization BE WILLING to cooperate/collaborate with the following organizations?				
a. CETA (now titled Job Training Partnership Act)	1	2	3	4
b. Proprietary schools (private vocational schools)	1	2	3	4
c. High schools	1	2	3	4
d. Community colleges	1	2	3	4

	None at all	Very Little	Some	Quite a bit
e. Universities	1	2	3	4
f. U.S. Military	1	2	3	4
g. Business and industry	1	2	3	4
h. Labor union apprenticeship programs	1	2	3	4
i. Other *(please specify)*_____				
_____	1	2	3	4

12. To what extent would your organization be willing to cooperate/collaborate in providing the following services, given time and resources?

a. career counseling	1	2	3	4
b. screening and referral	1	2	3	4
c. classroom training	1	2	3	4
d. on-the-job training	1	2	3	4
e. job placement	1	2	3	4
f. support services	1	2	3	4
g. other *(please specify)*_____				
_____	1	2	3	4

13. To what extent do you consider the following to be incentives for fostering cooperation/collaboration among providers of employment training?

a. legislative mandates	1	2	3	4
b. provision of quality services	1	2	3	4

	None at all	Very Little	Some	Quite a bit
c. elimination of duplicate services	1	2	3	4
d. better utilization of resources	1	2	3	4
e. evaluation of services	1	2	3	4
f. a master plan for cooperation/ collaboration	1	2	3	4
14. To what extent do you consider the following to be barriers to cooperation/collaboration among providers of employment training?				
a. inadequate communication methods	1	2	3	4
b. confusing and conflicting rules and regulations	1	2	3	4
c. turf protection	1	2	3	4
d. planning cycle problems	1	2	3	4
e. goal incongruence and role confusion	1	2	3	4
f. other *(please specify)*_____				
_____	1	2	3	4
Evaluation				
15. To what extent are your organization's employment training efforts evaluated internally?	1	2	3	4

	None at all	Very Little	Some	Quite a bit
16. To what extent are your organization's employment training efforts evaluated externally?	1	2	3	4
17. To what extent are each of the following criteria utilized to evaluate the success of your employment training efforts?				
a. job placement	1	2	3	4
b. employer feedback of job performance	1	2	3	4
c. assessment of student classroom performance	1	2	3	4
d. wages earned	1	2	3	4
18. To what extent are the following methods used to determine the type/content of employment training delivered by your organization?	1	2	3	4
a. labor market data	1	2	3	4
b. local employer needs and wants	1	2	3	4
c. individual trainee needs and wants	1	2	3	4
d. services provided by other organizations	1	2	3	4

19. To what extent do the trainers in your organization utilize the following methods to up-date their employment training skills?	None at all	Very Little	Some	Quite a bit
a. formal classroom education and training	1	2	3	4
b. on-the-job training	1	2	3	4
c. attendance at conferences	1	2	3	4
d. newsletters and journals	1	2	3	4
e. other *(please specify)*_____				
_____	1	2	3	4

Thank you for your cooperation.

If you would like a summary of the results, please write your name and address:

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B

Sample Letter

February 4, 1982

//2//

Dear Colleague:

Approximately two weeks ago you received a survey instrument regarding cooperation/collaboration among employment training delivery systems in Illinois. We look forward to receiving your input into the development of a comprehensive plan for employment training in Illinois which would enable providers to be more effective in delivering skill training programs and services.

You have been identified as having expertise and experience in employment training and your response is very important. Enclosed is a replacement survey and a self-addressed stamped envelope. Please take a few minutes of your time to respond. If you have already returned the survey we appreciate your response.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation!

Sincerely,

James A. Leach
Project Director

JAL/tgf/Wedl

enclosures

Appendix C

References

Agranoff, Robert, and Pattakos, Alex. Dimensions of services integration: Service delivery, program linkages, policy management, organizational structure. Rockfille, Maryland: Project SHARE Monograph Series, No. 13, 1979.

Apple, Michael W. Curriculum in the year 2000: Tensions and possibilities. Phi Delta Kappan, 1983 (January), 322.

Baker, David E. Illinois economic future and new technolgy: The special role of vocatiCnal education. Testimony before the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education. April 29, 1982.

Barton, T. E., Bobron, S. C., and Walsh, J. J. Industry/education community councils. NIE Papers in Education and Work, No. 9, 1977.

Boerrigter, Glenn C. Vocational education for the active forces. VocEd, 1983, 58 (2), 40-42.

Bottoms, Gene and Copa, Patricia. A perspective on vocational education today. Phi Delta Kappan, 1983 (January), 348-354.

Braithwaite, Ronald L. A case study and judicial evaluation of CETA/education linkages and their transferability. Final Report. Virginia: 1980.

Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor. National Apprenticeship and Training Standards for Plastering, 1975.

Burkett, Lowell A. The structure for providing a work force in today's world. In Merle E. Strong (ed.), Developing the nation's work force. A.V.A. yearbook 5, 1975.

Carnevale, Anthony. Getting the most from our training systems. VocEd, 1983, 58 (1), 24-27.

Cassell, Frank H., et al. Intergovernmental linkage and cooperation: Models for strengthening state and local management of manpower programs. Evanston, Illinois: Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University, 1976.

Clark, Harold F., and Davis, Joe C. Training in business and industry. In Merle E. Strong (ed) Developing the Nation's Work Force, American Vocational Association, Washington, D.C., 1975.

Davidson, Stephen M. Planning and coordination of social services in multiorganizational contexts. Social Service Review (March, 1976), 117-137.

Davis, Christopher. Private trade and technical schools. Voc Ed, 1983, 58 (1), 28-30.

Easterline, B. H. Coordination: A conceptual model and practical consideration. Paper delivered to the Education Commission of the States' National Seminar on State Capacity Building, December, 1976.

Evans, Rupert N. The role of the federal government in vocational education. A vocational education policy for the 1980's. Washington, D.C.: National Council on Employment policy, 1982.

Evans, Rupert N. Vocational education and reindustrialization. In Contemporary chailanges for vocational education, Yearbook of the American Vocational Association, 1982.

Flynn, Marilyn L. Obstacles of interagency coordination in local manpower networks. Journal of Health and Human Resources Administration 2 (Feburary, 1980), 299-312.

Gilbert, Neil and Specht, Harry. Quantitative aspects of social services coordination efforts: Is more better? Administration in Social Work 1 (Spring, 1977), 53-63.

Glover, Robert W. Apprentice training and vocational education as partners," in Katy B. Greenwood (ed.), Contemporary challenges for vocational education, American Vocational Association, Arlington, Virginia, 1981.

Governor's Manpower Planning Office. Report and recommendations of the governor's ad hoc committee for the coordination of state agency manpower programs. Madison, Wisconsin: 1978.

The Governor's Task Force on High Technology. Final Report, March 24, 1982.

Grabowski, Donald J. Apprenticeship today. VocEd, 1983, 58 (1), 30-31.

Greenwood, Kay. Education for work: Extent of coordination in Texas. Texas State Department of Community Affairs, 1981.

Griffin, Dean. A new partnership becomes law. VocEd, 58 (1), 32-35.

House of Representatives. Job training partnership act - Conference report. Report no. 97-889, 97th Congress, September, 1982.

Hoyt, Kenneth. Monograph on career education: Community resources for career education. U.S.D.H.E.W. Office of Career Education, Office of Education, 1976.

Kost, Robert J. Competition and innovation in continuing education. Training and Development Journal, 1980 (May), 48-67.

Lauffer, Armand. Social planning at the community level. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Leach, James A. Reindustrialization: Implications for vocational education. Columbus, Ohio: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1982.

Levine, S., and White, P. Exchange as a conceptual framework for the study of interorganizational relationships. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1960, 5, 583-601.

Levitan, Sar A.; Garth, Mangum, L.; and Marshall Kay, Human resources and labor markets, Harper and Row, Publishers, New York: 1976.

Louisiana CETA/Vocational Education Task Force Committee. CETA/vocational education coordination in Louisiana: A special task force progress report. Baton Rouge, LA: State of Louisiana, July, 1979.

Manpower and Vocational Education Weekly, Vol. 13, no. 41, October 14, 1982, 13 (41).

Marsh, Nancy D. Training records and information systems. In Training and development handbook: A guide to human resource development, Robert L. Craig (Ed.). McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1976.

Maryland CETA/Education Task Force. Rolf Blank, Kirschner Associates, Director. Academic credit for work experience in Maryland. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Boards of Education, April, 1979.

Maurice, Clyde. Multi-agency system linkages and coordination. In Contemporary challenges for vocational education Yearbook of the American Vocational Association, 1982.

Minnesota CETA - Education Task Force. Planning together: A guide for CETA and education program planners. Part of the National Association of State Boards of Education Study. St. Paul, MN, August, 1979.

Mitchell, James P. Apprenticeship today and tomorrow. In Vernon M. Briggs and Felician F. Foltman (Eds.), Apprenticeship research: Emerging findings and future trends. New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University. Proceedings of a Conference on Apprenticeship Training, Washington, D.C., May 1, 1980.

Molnar, Joseph Jr. and Rogers, David L. A comparative model of interorganizational conflict. Administrative Science Quarterly 24 (September, 1979) 405-425.

The National Apprenticeship Program United States Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1976.

National Association of State Boards of Education. CETA - Education collaboration issues in three states. Volume I. Washington, D.C., August, 1979.

The National Urban Coalition. Job training and the schools. Washington, D.C., 1980.

Nelson, Valerie I. and Ujakowich, Roberta A. Certification: Existing certificates and a proposal for CETA. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, January, 1980.

Pattakos, Alex and Smith, Russell L. Interagency coordination in the Illinois employment and training system: A blueprint. Dekalb, Illinois: Center for Governmental Studies, Northern Illinois University, 1982.

Pennsylvania Department of Education, Improvement of CETA/educational linkages. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: October, 1980.

Preston, Michael B. Coordinating CETA programs in Illinois: Responsibility vs. authority. Urbana, Illinois: Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois, October, 1980.

Roessler, Richard, and Mack, Greta. Strategies for interagency linkages: A literature review. Fayetteville, Arkansas: University of Arkansas, Arkansas Rehabilitation Services, 1975.

Santos, Gladys B. Job training systems: Many doors to success. VocEd, 1983, 58 (1), 23.

Swanson, Richard A. and Murphy, Brian P. The growing trend of industry and business training. In Katy Greenwood (Ed.), Contemporary challenges for vocational education, Yearbook of the American Vocational Association, 1981.

Thompson, James. Education for employment program, Executive summary. October 5, 1982.

Tuttle, Francis. Vocational education: Partners in productivity. National network for curriculum coordination in vocational and technical education. 1982, 8 (2).

Whetton, David A., and Flynn, Marilyn. Coordination between manpower agencies: An assessment ad recommendations. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Illinois, June 1979.

U.S. Conference of Mayors. CETA vocational education coordination: Highlights of selected studies. A report prepared under a U.S. Department of Labor contract as part of the technical assistance effort of the Employment and Training Administration's Office of Comprehensive Development, Washington, D.C., January 1981.